DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 634	FL 015 309
AUTHOR	Parker, Leann, Ed.
TITLE	Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Volume 5, Synthesis.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	153p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Children; Court Litigation; Curriculum Development; *Educational Objectives; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Financial Support; *Government Role; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Material Development; Non English Speaking; Policy Formation; Politics of Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; *Public Policy; Second Language Learning; State of the Art Reviews; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS	Bilingual Education Act 1968; Lau v Nichols

ABSTRACT

Four papers resulting from the fifth of a series of conferences on bilingual education are presented. "Current Perspectives" (L. Leann Parker, Shirley Brice Heath) discusses the status of bilingual education policy and related issues, including the problems of definition and goals, assessing bilingual education's effectiveness, program implementation, impact on English usage, foreign language use, and minority language communities. "At the Crossroads" (Rudolf C. Troike, Ernest Perez) examines the roles of State and Federal governments in bilingual education and alternatives to current practices in national legislative planning, research, program evaluation, student language assessment, and curriculum materials development. "Toward a Cross-Disciplinary View" (Roger W. Shuy) explores the interrelationships between bilingual education and other fields, including law, the social sciences, and education, and recommends a cross-discplinary approach to program development, implementation, and evaluation. "Thoughts on Non-English Speaking Children" (Lily Wong Fillmore) argues that children's various needs for getting and structuring linguistic input must be accommodated individually in bilingual education programs if such programs are to be successful. An extensive bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262634

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VOLUME 5

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES

Synthesis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G Richard Tucker

CAL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL015309

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

Library of Congress Catalog No.: 77-80381
ISBN: 87281-076-3

November 1978
Copyright © 1978
By the Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Printed in the U.S.A.

Contents

Preface v

Foreword vii

Introduction ix

Acknowledgments xi

Current Perspectives 1
L. Leann Parker, in consultation with Shirley Brice Heath

At the Crossroads 63
Rudolph C. Troike and Ernest Pérez

Toward a Cross-Disciplinary View 82
Roger W. Shuy

Thoughts on Non-English Speaking Children 89
Lily Wong Fillmore

Bibliography 99

Preface

The Center for Applied Linguistics, which serves as a national center for policy, research, and information in language and linguistics in the United States, is pleased to make this survey of *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives* available to decision-makers and others interested in this important and rapidly-developing field. These volumes, and the conferences from which they came, reflect a concern on the part of the Center that significant decisions are constantly being made regarding bilingual education--by judges, lawyers, legislators, policy planners, administrators, teachers, parents--frequently in the absence of adequate information on which to intelligently base those decisions.

Believing that informed decisions are crucial in efforts to effectively meet the needs of non- and limited-English-speaking students, the Center brought together leading specialists in the United States concerned with bilingual education from a number of disciplines, to provide the most complete compilation of information possible on this subject. The results reflect the complexity of the situation, as well as the relative paucity of research data resulting from an almost total lack of federal funding for research. It is a national scandal that the United States has spent over half a billion dollars on bilingual programs, and less than one-tenth of one percent of this amount on the basic research needed to improve the quality of programs. If defense systems and medical drugs were developed in the same way, we would certainly fear for our national safety and health. But in education, programs continue to be planned, and legislation implemented, with little thought for research. It is ironic that although Canada has probably spent one-tenth as much money on bilingual programs as the United States, most of the research available on bilingual education has and continues to come from Canada. This is a situation which policy-makers urgently need to remedy, if efforts to ensure equal education opportunity for limited-English-speaking students are to proceed with any confidence.

The Center for Applied Linguistics has been active since its inception in 1959 in the fields of teaching English to non-English speakers and the teaching of foreign languages, and in recent years has given priority to work in bilingual education in an effort to improve the quality and effectiveness of this approach to language instruction. Currently, the Center, in effect, serves as a national resource center in the field of bilingual education. Through its work in this field and its other research and service projects dealing with language and education, the Center has developed considerable capabilities for assisting schools and communities to meet the needs of multilingual populations.

The Center is grateful to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for providing financial support to this project, and to the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Washington, D.C. for their encouragement and funding of the development of a grant proposal.

I want to thank Leann Parker, who served as coordinator for the series of conferences and editor of these publications. She did an excellent job of a very complex task, and deserves our gratitude.

Rudolph C. Troike, Director
June 1977

Foreword

The nature of language and its relationship to culture is such that it is unfeasible to attempt to change one and not the other. Attempts have been made to teach English as a second language, as in the case of Puerto Rico, allowing the Puerto Rican society to maintain its native Spanish language and culture. In the case of Puerto Rico, the learning of English has become a necessity brought about by its close political and economic ties to the United States. In the past, the emphasis in the school system was placed on the study of English in order to Americanize the island.

Traditionally, the teaching of English as a second language in the United States has been geared toward the complete acculturation of foreign and ethnic groups to the mainstream of American society, without allowing these ethnic groups to use their mother tongue for any other purpose than social communication in their communities. However, the Puerto Ricans have determined that it is their right to keep Spanish as their first language and learn English as a second. In Puerto Rico, Spanish as the native tongue has been maintained for use not only in social settings but in overall economic and political communications, with English used as the language of technology.

The knowledge of more than one language has become a necessity in the world we live in today. Our close ties to each and every other member of the world has also made it necessary to understand the different cultures which comprise our society, without imposing any one language or culture on any member of that society.

This concern about the nature of language and culture and related education policies, both in the United States and Puerto Rico, led the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (OCPRW) to inquire more about what is actually happening in the field of bilingual education in terms of research and practices. As the Center for Applied Linguistics shared many of these same concerns, the OCPRW decided to support a proposal by CAL to develop an in-depth, objective state of the art study of the field. We hope that the papers presented in these volumes will bring a greater understanding of the issues and the state of our knowledge about various aspects of bilingual education and will provide a basis for sound decision-making in the future.

Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
in Washington, D.C.

June 1977

Introduction

Bilingual education is perhaps the most controversial movement in American education during the past decade. The future of many American children, particularly those from language minority groups, will be deeply affected by upcoming critical decisions relating to bilingual education, ranging from federal and state authorization and funding of programs to the type and quality of programs implemented.

Persons charged with developing educational legislation and policy, planning and carrying out programs and arguing legal issues, need information on characteristics of current programs and on research which assesses the educational values. Recognizing this need, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) sought support for an objective, multidisciplinary and comprehensive survey of bilingual education--a complex topic. Also recognizing this need, the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Washington (OCPRW), under the directorship of José Cabranes, provided support to the Center for the development of a grant proposal which was subsequently funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The OCPRW continued to assist the project through the participation of Carmen Delgado Votaw.

CAL commissioned major survey papers reviewing bilingual education from four different perspectives, two from the academic disciplines and two from professional fields. In a series of conferences, specialists within each area, with representatives of various federal agencies and other organizations, discussed and expanded these papers. The first four volumes of the *Current Perspectives* series contain these major survey papers and the respondents' viewpoints: social science, linguistics, law and education.

Topics in this volume were delineated in a fifth conference, held in the spring of 1977. Participants included some authors of the major papers in the other volumes and specialists from a variety of fields. Their tasks were to share information across disciplines, to synthesize empirical findings on various questions raised by decision-makers in bilingual education and to help formulate the content of this volume. This final volume attempts to summarize information presented in previous volumes and to focus on questions which lawmakers, school administrators, parents and the general public raise about bilingual education. Hence, this volume is directed to decision-makers who need a survey of research findings and a discussion of their varied practical implications.

The Center for Applied Linguistics wishes to express its appreciation to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for its generous and indulgent support of this project, and to project monitors, Vivien Stewart and Frederick Mosher, for their advice and assistance throughout the project.

We are equally indebted to all those who participated in the project, in the conferences, in preparing papers and in advising us along the way. Sincere thanks go to the steering committee, the project advisors, the Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Washington, writers of the major papers and the discussants--all of whom are listed at the end of this introduction.

Several persons deserve particular mention and my personal thanks for their assistance and moral support throughout the entire project, and particularly during the preparation of this volume. I would like to express my special appreciation to Rudolph C. Troike and Roger W. Shuy whose overview of the issues as well as support and recommendations provided valuable directions, and to Shirley Brice Heath whose insight and suggestions during the development of this volume and my paper were particularly helpful. Diane Bartosh also deserves many thanks for her careful and keen copy editing of the series--most especially of this final volume--as well as for her unflagging sense of humor which was a continuous source of inspiration.

Without the assistance of competent support staff it would not have been possible to plan and carry out the multitude of details and preparations essential to making the conferences run smoothly and getting the papers ready for publication. Sincere thanks go to Cynthia H. Gusky for her expert secretarial assistance, Debra Lee for typing earlier drafts of this volume and Sonia Kundert who typed the final published versions of the series.

L. Leann Parker
Project Coordinator
June 1978

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Center for Applied Linguistics expresses its special appreciation and thanks to those who participated in and prepared papers for the conferences, and to the Steering Committee and Advisors for their valuable suggestions, guidance, and moral support throughout the project.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

George Blanco, University of Texas at Austin (Education & Synthesis)
José A. Cárdenas, Intercultural Development Research Association, San Antonio (Education)
James Cummins, University of Alberta (Synthesis)
Charles A. Ferguson, Stanford University (Linguistics)
Lily Wong Fillmore, University of California, Berkeley (Synthesis)
Joshua A. Fishman, Yeshiva University (Social Sciences)
Gilbert N. García, Center for Applied Linguistics (Synthesis)
Joseph O. García, San Diego State University (Education)
Gustavo González, University of California, Santa Barbara (Linguistics)
Rosario C. Gingrás, Center for Applied Linguistics (Synthesis)
Tracy C. Gray, Center for Applied Linguistics (Synthesis)
William Hall, Rockefeller University (Education)
Byron Hansford, Council of Chief State School Officers, D.C. (Education)
Evelyn R. Hatch, University of California, Los Angeles (Linguistics)
Shirley Brice Heath, University of Pennsylvania (Social Sciences & Synthesis)
Richard J. Hiller, Teitelbaum and Hiller, Attorneys at Law, New York City [formerly Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund] (Law & Synthesis)
Dell Hymes, University of Pennsylvania (Synthesis)
Bea Medicine, University of Wisconsin, Madison (Synthesis)
Hugh Mehan, University of California, San Diego (Social Sciences)
Frederick Mosher, Carnegie Corporation (Synthesis)
Sarah Nieves-Squires, New York University (Social Sciences)
L. Leann Parker, Center for Applied Linguistics (All Five)
Lance D. Potter, Center for Applied Linguistics (Synthesis)
Christina Bratt Paulston, University of Pittsburgh (Linguistics)
Ernest Pérez, Texas Education Agency, Austin (Synthesis)
Stanley Pottinger, Pottinger and Company [formerly U.S. Department of Justice] (Synthesis)
Roy J. Rodríguez, Office of Civil Rights, DHEW (Law)
Sanford J. Rosen, Rosen, Remcho and Henderson, Attorneys at Law, San Francisco (Law)

Muriel Saville-Troike, Georgetown University (Synthesis)
H. Ned Seelye, Illinois State Department of Bilingual Education, Chicago (Social Sciences)
Roger W. Shuy, Center for Applied Linguistics and Georgetown University (Synthesis)
Edward Steinman, University of Santa Clara School of Law (Law)
Vivien Stewart, Carnegie Corporation (Synthesis)
María Swanson, Bilingual Education Service Center, Arlington Heights, Illinois (Education)
Herbert Teitelbaum, Teitelbaum and Hiller, Attorneys at Law, New York City [formerly Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund] (Law & Synthesis)
G. Richard Tucker, McGill University, Montreal and Ford Foundation in Cairo (Linguistics)
John Wabaunsee, Native American Rights Fund, Boulder, Colorado (Law)
Brian Weinstein, Howard University (Law)
Protase Woodford, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey (Education)

STEERING COMMITTEE

Mario Anglada, ASPIRA of America, New York City
Will Antell, Minnesota Department of Education, Minneapolis
Joaquín Avila, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, San Antonio
Arnold Leibowitz, Attorney at Law, D.C.
Roger W. Shuy, Center for Applied Linguistics and Georgetown University
Rudolph C. Troike, Center for Applied Linguistics
L. Leann Parker, Center for Applied Linguistics (Project Coordinator)

PROJECT ADVISORS

John Lum, San Francisco Unified School District
John Molina, Office of Bilingual Education, USOE
Frederick Mosher, Carnegie Corporation
Sara Sackett, Carnegie Corporation
Vivien Stewart, Carnegie Corporation
Herbert Teitelbaum, Attorney at Law, New York City
Carmen D. Votaw, Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, D.C.

Current Perspectives

L. Leann Parker
(in consultation with Shirley Brice Heath)

Language and education are inextricably bound together. The content of education--including many social values about language and culture--must be taught through the medium of language. In small, homogeneous communities or nations, choices about language and education are relatively straightforward, presumably because there is a consensus among the population(s). In more complex, multilingual societies, these decisions create tensions between and among various groups over which languages to use, how to use them and who makes that choice. Throughout history in various parts of the world, when more than one language has been at issue (1), some form of bilingual education has been employed to help accomplish societal goals. The same is true of American history.

Bilingual education is not new to the American educational scene. In the early 19th century, immigrant groups like the Germans established bilingual schools to help maintain their language and culture; public school systems of cities such as Cleveland and St. Louis provided bilingual instruction; teaching English to non-English speaking adults was common. Multilingualism was considered a national resource. By the 1920s, however, a focus on national unity emphasized a totally English speaking society (Heath [vol. 1] presents a review of language policy and bilingual education in the U.S.). Support of bilingualism by public institutions almost disappeared until interest was rekindled in the 1960s when minority groups stressed ethnic identity, when educational needs and rights of non- and limited-English speaking children were asserted and when new procedures and techniques in education were employed to promote better learning.

A number of educational innovations introduced in the 1960s, including open education, programmed learning, the inquiry approach and bilingual education, focus on children as learners and attempt to provide them with effective access to the contents and benefits of education. Current efforts in publicly supported bilingual education specifically attempt to provide these benefits to non- or limited-English speaking (NES/LES) children by bridging the gap between the culture and language these children bring to school and the traditional monolingual English speaking school identified with mainstream American language and culture. The goal is to help these NES/LES children maintain cognitive development and academic progress while they are learning English. The establishment of this form of bilingual education through public support was based on claims that initial literacy in the native language would facilitate transition to literacy in English; that the bilingual approach would allow children to learn English better than would other approaches; and that it would enhance the self-concept of language minority children, thus encouraging them to become better students.

The United States has always been and continues to be a land of linguistic and cultural diversity. Current estimates show that approximately 13 percent of the population--over 25 million people--live in households where languages other than English are spoken, and more than half a million people (one-fourth of whom are school age) speak no English (2). The majority reporting use of a language other than English are Spanish speakers, but there are also large populations reporting the use of other languages. Certain U.S. regions are known for their large concentrations of speakers of certain languages including the Mexican Americans of the Southwest, the Navajos of Arizona and New Mexico, the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska, the Hawaiians and Japanese of Hawaii, the French speakers of Louisiana and northern New England, the Sioux tribes of the Great Plains, the Puerto Ricans of the Northeast, the Cantonese of California and the Portuguese of New England. Major U.S. metropolitan areas are a great mix of ethnic and culture groups whose membership varies in number and distribution. For example, in one Washington, D.C. suburb, there are over 50 language groups with Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, Hindi, Arabic and Farsi among the more commonly spoken languages of the children who enter the school system. New York City, Seattle, Detroit and Chicago have large and even more diverse multilingual populations.

Heated controversy over the issue of bilingual education exists between those who favor it instead of other ways of educating NES/LES students, between those who restrict publicly supported bilingual education to these NES/LES children and between those who favor bilingual education to achieve other language and social goals. Competing goals of different groups raise questions.

•*How much of a student's native language should be used?*

•*Should maintenance of a student's native language be publicly financed?*

•*Who--policy makers according to the perceived needs of the children, the school or the nation--should set the criteria for "best"?*

•*How should bilingual programs be defined--according to local community, state or federal terms?*

•*What effect may bilingual education have on American society and the English language?*

•How should local school administrators design, implement and finance local programs which are appropriate for the children and which comply with existing court-mandated and legislative rulings?

A synthesis of the issues and relevant research findings is needed to assist decision-makers at federal, state and local levels in designing appropriate and feasible programs which will meet the needs of all the students in the United States as well as to assist researchers in providing answers to the yet unanswered questions. Relying on the other volumes in this series, this paper analyzes the state of the art of bilingual education: the various forms and factors that influence it, the goals held by different groups, claims made by proponents and opponents, relevant research, problems faced by administrators and the impact of bilingual education on the United States. Although particular emphasis is placed on bilingual education for children who have difficulty with English, bilingual education is also treated in its broader perspective--that of an educational approach with the potential to serve the language objectives of a variety of groups when more than one language is an issue. Despite the polemics surrounding this most controversial topic, it must be remembered that it is children we are trying to educate and it is for them that this paper and this volume have been written.

THE PROBLEM OF DEFINITION

Definitions and Goals

Fixed definitions of bilingual education, bilingualism, language proficiency or many of the terms which re-occur in planning, implementing, maintaining and evaluating programs do not exist. The differing goals of various groups active in bilingual education help prevent consensual agreement on these terms. In particular, bilingualism and bilingual education are defined along a continuum of many possible variations (several scholars have developed typologies and models of bilingual education, see Fishman, vol. 1). The selection of any particular definition depends heavily on the vested interests of the group doing the defining. The failure to achieve a consensus of goals and definitions of bilingual education in the United States stems from numerous competing, somewhat overlapping and often conflicting goals held by parents, teachers, school administrators, law makers, the general public and by researchers who study various aspects of bilingual education. Problems in defining goals are further complicated by minority group strivings for cultural recognition and language choice (each language minority group defining these on its own terms); pressures for national unity in language and culture; parental and student (minority and majority group) attitudes and aspirations for language use as well as educational and vocational goals; what the federal government is willing to support; definitions of the Office of Civil Rights; the prevalent tendency to assume that all varieties of bilingual education and bilingualism have the same effectiveness with all groups; and the use of different ways to study bilingualism and bilingual education.

Many language minority group parents see English as a key to success in the education system, and this in turn the key to a good job later in life. Some groups within minority communities want a means to shore up their political bases. In some cases, adults of these language minority communities want to use bilingual education as a means to greater access to jobs and the middle class. Some minority groups want to use publicly funded bilingual education as a means to achieve their acceptance by the majority group, and to maintain their identity through maintenance of their language. Other minority groups, notably many American Indian groups, want to use it to revitalize their languages among their youth. Other groups see it as a means of teaching English speaking children (of any ethnic group) a language other than English for enrichment purposes (3).

Educators base their ideals for students on assumptions about what the standards of speaking, reading and writing should be. They explain that these standards are those which are basic to a successful academic career and ultimately to achieving economic security. In addition, many educators argue that providing traditional mainstream instruction (without additional services such as bilingual education), is less expensive, more efficient and more time-honored than bilingual-multicultural education; thus they agree that to do other than give all students a basic mainstream curriculum is to cheat them (issues revolving around programming or bilingual education may be found in Fishman, vol. 1; Tucker, vol. 2; Paulston, vol. 2; González, vol. 2; Blanco, vol. 4).

Policy-makers often view individuals' needs as less important than the maintenance of mechanisms of solidarity for the nation. Often unaware of the long-standing language loyalty among the many different language groups in the U.S., policy-makers and native English speakers argue for an English-only, monocultural education.

Group goals are complicated by definitions of terms used in legal and educational documents related to bilingual education; these terms and their use in funding and civil rights legislation and regulations (4) shape the kinds of programs that may be developed since they then take on legal and binding meaning. Therefore, individual or group desires for bilingual schooling may or may not be feasible.

Dissent over definitions, which are closely allied with goals, continues unabated within language minority groups as well as among the various minority and majority groups. Answers are difficult, with *no one* answer being correct for everyone. Moreover, the many issues and debates associated with bilingual education often obscure the central issue: educating children.

The future of bilingual education depends in large measure on how satisfied decision-makers at various levels are that it provides equal educational opportunity and meets students' needs. The question is whether bilingual education can achieve the same ultimate goals that "traditional" American education purports to achieve.

Terms

Over the past few years numerous terms have been adopted to talk about language, bilingual education programs and students in bilingual programs. They have since evolved their own connotations and relevance for American education although many may be used with reference to other settings. Some of the more frequently used terms (although not an exhaustive list) include the following.

◆*Bilingualism* which indicates some degree of proficiency in a second language. Researchers are discovering the complex nature of what constitutes language "proficiency." Arbitrary definitions of language "proficiency" are adopted for particular purposes such as eligibility for a bilingual program.

◆*Bilingual education* refers to some configuration of instruction through the medium of two languages. In the U.S., this means teaching skills in English as well as another language and teaching content through the medium of both languages. Attempts to put this definition into practice have resulted in a wide variety of programs. Federal legislative definitions which limit bilingual programs almost exclusively to children whose language is other than English have had a significant impact on the types of bilingual programs available to U.S. students. Although some changes in definition are being proposed in current legislation, the 1974 Federal definition (PL 93-380, sec. 703) is as follows:

> (A) The term *program of bilingual education* means a program of instruction, designed for children of limited English-speaking ability in elementary or secondary schools, in which...(i) there is instruction given in, and study of, English and to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability, and such instruction is given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of such children, and, with respect to elementary school instruction, such instruction shall, to the extent necessary, be in all courses or subjects of study which will allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system; and....
>
> (B) A program of bilingual education may make provision for the voluntary enrollment to a limited degree therein, on a regular basis, of children whose language is English...[but], priority shall

> be given to the children whose language is other than English. In no event shall the program be designed for the purpose of teaching a foreign language to English-speaking children....

◆*Limited English speaking (LES) or students of limited English speaking ability (LESA)* are students who have been judged (usually by some arbitrary criteria) as knowing some English, but not knowing enough to participate effectively and actively in a totally English-medium classroom.

◆*Non-English speaking (NES)* are students who are judged not to be able to speak English at all and who would have difficulty in a monolingual English classroom.

◆*Linguistically and culturally different students* is used in reference to the majority, White, English speaking culture of the United States; it does not include Blacks or many Indian groups because they are presumed to speak English (i.e. it does not view nonstandard varieties of English as being "linguistically different"), even though they are culturally different. It does include persons of other ethnic and cultural groups who come from a non-English speaking background, such as Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Chinese, Koreans, French, Navajos, Choctaw and others.

◆*Linguistic/language minority groups* refers to groups of people who have a language other than the major or dominant language of the nation. It is a designation similar to "culturally and linguistically different students."

◆*Linguistically disadvantaged* refers to people who do not speak the dominant language of the country--or English, in the case of the United States. The term was first used in connection with compensatory programs because it was assumed that students could not learn unless they could speak English well and that it was the duty of American education to teach them English so that they could have access to the advantages that education brings. The connotation of this term does not recognize that one's home language (whatever it may be) can be as rich and useful in one's own community as English can be in school and work. This term is now considered rather pejorative and paternalistic in the U.S.

◆*Native language/home language/mother tongue/first language/* L_1 generally refer to the language that a child first learns. It may or may not be a written language and it may or may not be used in school. For example, the native language of monolingual English speaking children is English; the first language of many Hispanic children is Spanish, for others English.

◆*Second language/*L_2 is the next language a person (at any age) acquires either formally through school instruction or informally through communication with speakers of that language. It may or may not be the primary language used by the school or community.

◆*Primary language* refers to the language used most frequently. The primary language of many bilinguals in the U.S. is English, although for some it is their home language (which may or may not be English).

◆*Language dominance/dominant language/primary language.* Dominance is a vague term referring to the language that a person can use most fluently. It assumes that a person is more proficient in *all* communication situations (and if the person is old enough, it assumes proficiency in reading and writing if the language has that tradition). A dominant language may or may not be a native or home language; for example, some Mexican Americans may learn Spanish initially, but their social situation changes so that they primarily use English and become more dominant in that language, whereas native English speakers who learn some French in high school are dominant English speakers.

◆*Language proficiency* refers to specific language skills possessed in each of the languages known. Proficiency may refer to the degree to which a person controls the syntactic, or phonological (sound system), or lexicon (vocabulary) of a language, and/or fluency in using it appropriately according to the social situation.

◆*Compensatory.* In a compensatory bilingual program, the focus is on teaching the most prestigious language of a country to those who do not already know it, i.e. to "remediate" or "compensate for" the "linguistic deficiencies" so those people will be able to participate more effectively in the predominant culture of that country. For example, teaching English to Spanish speaking Mexican American students or speakers of any other language in the United States. Bilingual education in the U.S. as funded by the Federal government today has primarily assumed this perspective (see Fishman, Heath and Nieves-Squires, vol. 1).

◆*Enrichment.* In contrast to the above, an enrichment bilingual program focuses on teaching students another language to give them fluency in and appreciation of another language; the other language may be the language of the students' heritage or it may be another language which the students may find useful in later life. In many cases it refers to teaching a speaker of the dominant or official language of a nation another language, as in the U.S. when monolingual English speaking students receive part of their curriculum through the medium of French or another language (see Fishman, vol. 1).

◆*Maintenance.* A maintenance bilingual program refers to instruction in a program whose goal is not only to teach skills in the dominant language of a country (majority language) to students of a linguistic minority group, but also to maintain language skills and literacy in the students' home language. Content instruction is offered through the medium of both languages so that, in theory, the students will learn to use both languages equally well.

◆*Transitional.* In a transitional bilingual program, the goal is to use the students' native language as a medium of instruction only until they can function effectively in the dominant language of the school (i.e. the dominant language of the nation).

Most U.S. programs are designed around this model: children are taught through their home language (e.g., French) while learning English as a second language. Then, usually after two or three years (or whatever criteria is established by the school or state), it is assumed that they know enough English to participate in English-only classrooms for the rest of their school career.

◆*Immersion.* An immersion bilingual program refers to a specific design of a program. In this type of program students of one language group are taught only through the medium of the second language and only after a specified period of time are they given specific limited instruction in language arts skills in their native language. Perhaps the most famous programs of this type are those found in French speaking Canada, in which native English speaking students are taught in French-medium schools. The Culver City and Redwood City (Calif.) programs are similar to Canadian programs in design, but use Spanish. Analyses of these programs can be found in Tucker, vol. 2.

◆*Submersion* refers to the type of program in which both native and non-native speakers of the dominant language are taught together through the medium of the dominant language, but there is little or no instruction for non-native speakers in their language or for developing language arts skills in their native language. However, some instruction in English as a second language is sometimes provided for the LES/NES students. This practice has been the major method of dealing with LES/NES students in U.S. public education in recent years (see Paulston, vol. 2).

◆*Bilingual-bicultural education.* Bilingual-bicultural programs are those bilingual programs (of any type) which also try to emphasize aspects of the culture or national origin of the LES/NES group. Usually the curriculum concentrates on the more obvious and superficial aspects of that culture, such as the foods, customs, holidays, history, etc. The goal is to foster pride in the LES/NES students' national origin, language and themselves. Although there is some preliminary research on the more subtle aspects of culture such as preferred learning styles, cultural/national values, etc., the findings are only tentative and so far, little has been directly applied to classroom use.

◆*Multicultural education* is an expansion on the theme of bicultural education. Rather than focusing on just one other culture, multicultural education seeks to teach all students (whether in monolingual programs or in bilingual programs) something about the major ethnic groups in America in order to give the students an appreciation of the contributions of each group to the U.S. As with bilingual education, the emphasis is on the more visible or outward manifestations of culture (5).

◆*Language revitalization program* is usually proposed for those American Indian groups who have lost their ancestral language over the years and are now English speakers, and wish to have their ancestral languages taught to their children in school. Some bilingual programs have been proposed to revive the native language of these people. Those in the group who still speak the ancestral language are called on to help teach it.

◆*English as a second language programs* (sometimes called ESL or ESOL--English to speakers of other languages) are formal programs of training (usually characterized by particular language teaching methodology) for teaching English language skills (speaking, understanding, reading and writing) to speakers of other languages. It can be used in conjunction with either a regular monolingual English program of instruction *or* with a bilingual program.

◆*Second language instruction.* Students studying a language which is not their primary language (e.g. English speakers being taught Spanish or Korean) are given instruction similar to ESL in that language (Spanish as a second language--SSL or Korean as a second language--KSL). These programs are usually found in conjunction with enrichment bilingual programs and with some regular programs.

ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Will bilingual education work? Is it worth the money being spent on it? Is some other approach more feasible and just as or more effective? These are some of the questions that schools, parents, funding agencies, legislators and taxpayers are asking. They want to know what is the best way to educate children, especially NES/LES children. They want to know whether their particular educational goals are being accomplished, and they want to know if they are getting their money's worth. Unfortunately, there are no clear, simple answers. On the one hand there is a major controversy between those who favor bilingual education and those who favor other approaches to educating NES/LES children--the other major approach being formal training in English language skills or ESL-only (English as a second language) in conjunction with the regular monolingual English program offered by schools. On the other hand is the growing body of research data to which many look for guidance in making a decision regarding the implementation of a bilingual education or other program for establishing quality education for these students. This section reviews the claims of proponents of both ESL-only and bilingual education (which includes ESL with native language instruction) as well as the findings from relevant research.

The Bilingual Education versus ESL Controversy

A major controversy in the education of LES/NES students centers on the effectiveness of bilingual schooling over regular monolingual English schooling supplemented by formal training in English (ESL-only). Even though both ESL-only and bilingual education have a similar goal of teaching the students English, it is assumed that one approach "must" be better than the other for all situations.

Advocates of ESL-only (as opposed to bilingual education *with* ESL) argue that the greatest need that an LES/NES student has is to learn English as quickly as possible in order to succeed in school and later in the job market. They feel that the least costly and the most sensible way to serve this special need for rapid learning of English is to provide ESL with regular instruction. Toward this goal, LES/NES students are typically "pulled out" of class part of each day for concentrated practice on oral English skills. They then participate for the rest of the day in the regular program, on the assumption that as they learn more English, these students will catch up quickly with their monolingual English peers in academic subjects. Since the focus is on assimilation of these students, little attention is paid to the LES/NES children's home language or culture (although this trend may be changing owing to recent emphases on multicultural education). This type of programming allows the school to maintain its regular program of instruction which it has developed to help students attain success in mainstream American social and economic life (according to how the school district and community define success), while at the same time providing a special assistance to LES/NES children.

Some of the following arguments have been proposed in response to the ESL-only approach. Advocates of bilingual education see several weaknesses in the traditional ESL approach. One is that the NES/LES students miss a considerable amount of subject content, both during the period when they are pulled out and even when they are in their regular class, since they do not have enough English to understand. This is a major reason given for the generally poor academic performance of LES/NES students.

Other claims favoring a bilingual approach argue that ESL programs traditionally focus on grammatical structure and pronunciation drills, important to be sure, but limited in scope. Proponents of this view feel that ESL-only students have little opportunity to learn how to use English appropriately in a variety of social situations. (However, there is a recent trend in ESL classes to put more emphasis on broader communication skills.) Another weakness cited is that the segregation of LES/NES students in the ESL-only approach limits the interaction of these students with their native English speaking peers, thus restricting opportunities for further English language learning and at the same time encouraging isolation from the mainstream.

Bilingual education was proposed to counteract such weaknesses. It values the child's native language and culture. Teachers use the native language of the children for some content instruction (so that they will not fall behind academically and cognitively) until they are able to handle content instruction in English. However, there is accord with ESL-only advocates about the need for NES/LES students to learn English, instruction in English language skills and instruction through the medium of English.

Bilingual education advocates feel that bilingual education meets other needs of LES/NES students which are as important as learning English, and they feel there is a strong rationale for providing instruction through two languages. They see the following among the advantages.

(a) In order to effectively participate in the classroom, and to have real access to the educational services offered by the school, NES/LES students must have more than equal services and facilities. These children must, from the time they enter the school system, understand what is going on, and be able to communicate with the teacher in appropriate ways. Later, as they are taught specific skills such as reading, writing, computation and content area subjects (social studies, math, science), they must still be able to have two-way communication to continue developing. Because language is the critical component in the receipt and transmission of information, proponents of bilingual education claim that education services are best rendered when students and teacher speak a common language.

(b) A major service of education is the broadening of students' language skills and abilities to deal with the adult world. For many proponents of bilingual education this means that students should be able to function well as adults in the home community as well as in the larger world. In order to participate effectively in the larger world, students need to be prepared for certain things: be competent in numerous basic skills (reading, writing and computation); be able to get a job; have access to or have some knowledge of the means of achieving social mobility, if they so desire. In the U.S. where verbal facility in English is highly valued, this means to be able to effectively handle the English language according to job and social position.

The students' own communities are an important dimension of the larger world. Unless students decide to completely break home ties, they must be able to "go home again." Advocates of bilingual education see the ability to speak and perhaps also read and write the home language in addition to English as a sound, psychological advantage--not a drawback.

(c) Proponents of bilingual education feel that an individual's psychological well-being is ensured in part through having the home language and culture accepted in the classroom. Language and cultural understanding are keys to positive self-images and to academic and non-academic success.

Research and Bilingual Education

In order to assess the soundness of various claims for or against a particular approach, many have looked to research for evidence. But, bilingual education is an extremely complicated issue to research and therefore to assess, because of the many possible variations of programs, the inability to control many significant influencing variables and because of the differing goals of the many groups who want some say over how their children are educated. Also, many variables (also see Laosa, 1976; Cervantes, 1976) which affect the success of a bilingual program are frequently those which affect the success of any school program, and it is difficult to separate the effects of the educational services in general and those of bilingual education in particular. Among the multitude of variables which must be considered are: (a) *School administration's* policies, objectives, finances; state and federal obligations and constraints; initiative; attitudes; materials and facilities. (b) *Teachers', principals' and paraprofessionals'* attitudes toward the district, the program and the LESA community; initiative; experience and training; and cultural sensitivity. (c) *The community's (dominant and LESA)* population trends; attitudes toward language use; language(s) spoken; patterns of language use; native language support mechanisms for non-English (e.g. radio and television programs, periodicals, enclaves or families, businesses, immigration, etc.); attitudes toward education; aspirations for children; attitudes toward the dominant culture; possibilities for socio-economic mobility. (d) *Students'* backgrounds and patterns of language use (since they reflect their parents to some extent); predisposition of English speaking and non-English speaking to mix; peer attitudes and pressures; outside obligations (e.g. family, job, etc.) and cultural values towards those obligations; preferred learning styles, motivation; attitudes toward school and education; possibilities for jobs and social/economic/educational mobility in later life.

Several of these factors specifically affect the success of a bilingual program. Among them are community support and involvement, commitment on the part of the administration, flexibility in selection and assignment of teachers and other resources, organizational responsibility within the school district administration, well-defined program objectives and systematic plans for implementation, well-organized program monitoring and evaluation procedures, and teachers' and principals' attitudes toward the students and the program. The success or failure of even a well-designed program with sufficient funds, materials and a qualified, capable staff in a given situation or in a given year depends on the interrelation of most of these factors. (See Blanco, vol. 4, for additional discussion on planning and implementing bilingual programs.)

Often studies are difficult to judge and interpret because many of the most important variables are difficult if not impossible to control or to measure in a research study--and the variation among bilingual programs is enormous (see Cummins, vol. 4). Because the criteria for judging success are diverse, many complications arise in designing and carrying out research studies. Furthermore, owing to limited funds for conducting research, particularly longitudinal studies, there are few and rather scattered research studies which may or may not provide the conclusive evidence desired at this time. Moreover, what a researcher looks for in a particular program evaluation or research study is greatly influenced by factors such as the definitions used, the theoretical framework, methodology and conditions of the school and/or community. These factors--frequently inconsistent across time periods, cultural settings and researchers--make generalizations across studies risky. A review of the research evidence, however, allows several general statements to be made about bilingual education:

●Social factors are perhaps the preeminent variables in the success or failure of a bilingual program and in language maintenance or loss.

●Social and psychological factors which a school may not be able to control are also important in how well a person acquires both languages (native language and second language).

●Frequency of contact and use of a language are important factors in the acquisition of a second language. A contributing factor is formal instruction in the language, although the extent to which this aids acquisition or maintenance of the first or second language is yet to be determined.

●All evidence does not support the common dictum that the younger the children are the better they learn a second language --evidence (Hatch, vol. 2) suggests that various aspects of a second language may be learned better at different ages (however, these stages have not yet been defined).

●Bilingual education will most likely "succeed" in those instances in which any educational approach can be expected to succeed, i.e. bilingual schooling of any kind is more effective in achieving language and other educational goals when dollar and community support is high, and where there are competent teachers and motivated students.

●Neither bilingualism nor bilingual schooling seem to have a negative effect on students' academic progress and cognitive development as long as positive social support exists, and the program is stable and well managed.

●There are many types of bilingual education; no *one* type is best for *all* situations.

●Bilingual education is very complex, and many questions require a great deal more research. Many of the authors in the series specify current research needs; the reader is referred to Fishman, Heath, Mehan and Weinstein (vol. 1); Tucker, González, Hatch and Paulston (vol. 2); Blanco, Cummins and Woodford (vol. 4); and, in this volume, Shuy and Troike and Pérez.

Many specific questions about bilingual education center on its effect on cognitive or conceptual development, how well children learn to read, scholastic achievement in general, students' attitudes and self-concepts and how well they learn skills in the first and second language. Available findings in each of these areas are discussed below (6).

Bilingual Education and Cognitive Development /Concept Formation

Cognitive refers to an individual's mental processes in manipulating concepts or, the ability to think. Concepts are developed in sequence as a child matures. Language ability and cognitive ability are not necessarily synonymous. For example, a child may have the notion of "past" or the notion of something being longer than something else, but not be able to use language to express it. Because this dividing line between cognitive and linguistic abilities is extremely hard to fix, it is difficult to study the effect of learning a second language at different ages on the development of a child's thinking or conceptual cognitive processes.

A review of studies which have investigated the effect of bilingualism and schooling in the native language (when it is not the prestigious language of the country) and schooling in the second language generally supports the notion that bilingualism and bilingual education foster development of those mental processes which are called *concept formation* or cognition (see Paulston, vol. 2). Some studies suggest that bilingual instruction may, in fact, facilitate concept formation (see Paulston, vol. 2; Cummins, vol. 4). Barik and Swain (1976) suggest that bilinguals in immersion programs may also have cognitive advantages. Malherbe's South African study (as reported in Paulston, 1974) emphasized the benefits of bilingual schooling for all children and especially for those children of lower intelligence.

Nonetheless, there are several studies (see the discussion in Cummins, vol. 4), which show less positive findings (see, e.g., Torrance et al, 1970; Macnamara, 1966). Fishman (vol. 1) reminds us that "we are still a long way from this kind of research on the socio-cognitive-emotional concomitants of bilingualism and bilingual education" which will tell us the relationship between social factors, pedagogical factors and a person's first and second language abilities. Cummins (vol. 4), however, describes a program evaluation model which should assist in determining what educational practices promote and inhibit cognitive development given a child's particular competencies in both languages.

Cummins' analyses also (1976 and 1977) suggest that there may be an important relation between a child's relative competence in two languages, cognitive development and social and educational factors. Two recent studies of Finnish migrant children in Sweden by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) and Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas (1977) claim that first language nurturing is an important factor in concept development and academic achievement.

Bilingual Education and Reading

Several widely differing studies on very different populations (Indians in Chiapas, Mexico; Blacks and Puerto Rican students in New York; Irish students in Ireland) (7) reveal rather positive indications that bilingual instruction does *not* hinder reading ability in the second language. Children in bilingual programs appear to be able to read the second language (English in most of these studies) at grade level or above as compared with control groups. The St. Lambert French immersion program (Tucker, vol. 2) shows equally positive results among middle-class English speaking students learning French as a second language, as did the study of an Irish immersion school (Cummins, vol. 4 [1977B]).

On the other hand, negative findings have been reported in Cohen's (et al) studies of the Redwood City Spanish bilingual program, one of the few American programs to be studied systematically over a number of years. The program children (primarily lower socio-economic level Spanish speakers) were taught to read Spanish and English almost simultaneously rather than Spanish first. They scored lower on standardized English reading tests than a control group which was taught in English exclusively. Macnamara's (1966) study of Irish students also found lower reading scores of children who were taught bilingually.

Other studies have looked at how well children learn to read their native language. Most studies show, not unexpectedly, that children in bilingual programs read in their native language better than children from a similar population who were not in bilingual programs. Yet, in the St. Lambert immersion experiment, in which the native language of the children was English and for which instruction in English was limited to a language arts class (which began at grade two), children maintained average levels of reading achievement in both languages.

Looking at reading and minority groups from a different angle, McDermott (1977) argues that cultural conflict has a major impact in determining degrees of literacy. He theorizes that cultural conflict arising from an educational system imposed by the dominant cultural group predisposes minority group children to learn how *not* to read rather than how *to* read--even if the dominant culture is extremely concerned about teaching the children to read. Basing his argument on evidence from many different cultures, he notes that homogeneous cultures (such as White Americans, Scots and Japanese) tend to have high literacy rates while minority groups within one country (such as Native Americans, Blacks and Chicanos in U.S. society) consistently tend toward lower literacy levels, even when it is in their self-interest to read well. Similar cases are found among the Lapps in Norway, Indian people in South America, Irish Catholics in Northern Ireland and Koreans under Japanese domination. Yet, McDermott found these to be in contrast to the much higher literacy rates in minority groups who have control over their own education (such as the Tibetan and Mongolian groups in China and the Amish in Pennsylvania), and in cases where students and teachers from the dominant cultural background form a community and work out their own strategies (such as in some German classrooms where the teacher speaks and teaches only the more prestigious High German to students of Low German speaking backgrounds). The St. Lambert experience would seem to lend support to this hypothesis: it has been frequently noted that successful findings in this study may very well be attributable to the fact that the students are from the majority culture--middle-class English speaking backgrounds and that their parents are highly supportive of the program.

Bilingual Education and Academic Achievement

Lower achievement of language minority group students in U.S. regular education programs has been well documented for a number of years (see Gezi, 1975; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975). As a result, educators and others have been experimenting with other approaches which might improve the scholastic achievement of these students.

A number of studies and surveys of studies have compared bilingual and regular programs in terms of student performance in various subjects, but primarily in English language arts (reading and writing skills), native language arts and math, rather than other subjects. The majority of these studies have focused on elementary level Spanish-English students.

Paulston (vol. 2) cites several studies which show rather positive effects of bilingual education on student achievement. Cohen (1973) found that bilingually taught Mexican American children's English skills (oral, reading and writing) were somewhat less advanced than those of similar children where they were taught in English only. Flores' (1969) study of Cuban students showed the same trend. Weffer (1972) reported similar results from a much briefer observation, but found that English skills were equal. Skoczylas (1972) found no difference in English skills, while Olesini (1971) found greater proficiency in the English skills of bilingually instructed students. Trueba (1976) cites several positive reports, among them Treviño's (1968) study of Texas elementary school Anglo and Mexican American students taught bilingually. The students in Treviño's study performed as well as others in math, and the Mexican Americans in the programs performed better than other Mexican Americans taught only in English.

In sum, the findings are inconclusive and rather contradictory, although again there appears to be growing evidence that LESA students in bilingual programs achieve at approximately the same level of similar students taught in English-only programs. Dulay, Burt and Zappert (1976) (see discussion in Blanco, vol. 1), in an extensive analysis of research studies and evaluation reports, found evidence that bilingual education has, at best, a positive effect on student achievement and, at worst, a negligible effect, i.e. students perform equally well in bilingual and regular programs.

There is little evidence to show that language minority students in bilingual programs are achieving as well as monolingual English speaking middle-class students in regular classrooms, as most studies compare language minority students in bilingual programs with similar students in regular programs. A cautiously optimistic longitudinal study conducted among children in Santa Fe, New Mexico who have been continuously enrolled in a Title VII bilingual program for five years shows rather impressive trends in math and reading achievement when compared to national norms (Leyba, 1978).

A study with contrasting, although rather unsurprising findings, is the 1976 General Accounting Office (GAO) Report (see Blanco, vol. 1) of 16 bilingual education projects which shows that students dominant in English achieved higher scores in reading and math (on tests given in English) than did students dominant in a language other than English. An evaluation report (1977) by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) (Blanco, vol. 1) of Title VII Spanish-English bilingual programs shows mixed results of student achievement. This study shows that Title VII Hispanic students' English language proficiency had not increased as much as that of similar students in regular programs, although they performed much better in math. The findings of both this and the GAO study have been called into question for their weaknesses in research design (8).

In general, such studies show that Spanish-background students in bilingual programs have as high or higher achievement in Spanish language arts and math (even math tested in English) than their counterparts in regular programs (Cohen, 1973; Flores, 1969). Skoczylas (1972) did conclude, however, that math skills taught in Spanish did not transfer well to tests of math in English. Nonetheless, Paulston (vol. 2) notes that Skoczylas' study showed that students, whether in bilingual or in regular programs, performed at grade level. Many longitudinal studies show greater gains the first year the students are in bilingual programs and the gains level off in succeeding years (Paulston, vol. 2). This regression is "common to all compensatory or remedial education programs (Blanco, vol. 4)."

In order to be able to make more conclusive statements about bilingual education's effect on academic achievement, more tightly controlled longitudinal studies of different language groups which compare target students in bilingual and regular programs with their English speaking peers are necessary. Longitudinal studies are needed to determine whether gains are lasting (past the initial halo or Hawthorne effect) and whether or not students can perform at grade level. Intervening factors, such as socio-economic status (SES), as they affect student performances even among monolingual English speaking students must also be taken into account.

Bilingual Education and Student Attitudes and Self-Concepts

"When a teacher tells a student that what he learns in school is valid and real and that what he grew up with is wrong, the student may have vague misgivings and experience momentary anxiety. But what is he to do? From that moment on, there is an ever-deepening chasm that permanently separates perceived life from reality (Hall, 1977)." One of the more frequent rationales for bilingual schooling for language minority students is that it will improve students' attitudes towards themselves, school, their home community and the community at large. Yet, because this is one of the most difficult claims to assess, conclusions from studies are at best tentative. The measurement of attitudes and self-concepts is in its infancy--use of standardized tests for measuring these aspects is often questioned because they are extremely difficult to define for adequate standardized measures, and because there are so many uncontrolled variables. However, findings from several evaluations using available instruments agree that bilingual schooling fosters positive attitudes towards self, peers (both Anglos and non-Anglos), school and community. Some of these studies include Skoczylas (1972), Rivera (1973), Cohen (1973) and Velásquez (1973). Other studies indicate that bilingual education may have a positive effect on attitudes toward school if reduced drop out rates are considered an indication. A 1975 Office of Civil Rights report on bilingual education cites such results from a fourth year Title VII evaluation (1972-73) of a Philadelphia secondary bilingual program: Spanish speaking students who had been in the program since the tenth grade were four times as likely to graduate as nonparticipating Spanish speaking children in the same school and twice as likely to graduate as any students in the city. Other studies of Mexican American students show that students who maintain cultural ties are more likely to make academic progress than those who break their cultural ties (Campbell, 1973).

Bilingual Education and Language Learning

The learning of language skills (speaking, reading and writing) is a major focus of education. During the last 50 years, this focus has concentrated on English language skills with or without special instruction (ESL) for students who know little or no English when they come to school. Bilingual education has brought a new focus and with it controversy. The new focus is on acquisition of skills in the children's native language as well as in a second (and perhaps a third) language. The language controversy has primarily centered on whether NES/LES children can learn English well through bilingual education or whether some other approach, such as ESL in conjunction with the school's regular instructional program, might work just as well or better. This brings up questions of what factors influence how well a child is likely to learn another language and how he learns it. Answers to such questions can provide guidance to make program instruction more appropriate for second language learning in whatever approach is selected for the education of children.

There are many problems in studying the effect of a bilingual approach on language learning. Language proficiency in either a first or second language is difficult to define and is closely linked with the speaker's ability to use the language appropriately in a variety of specific situations. Further there are many social and psychological variables that affect language learning--some of which schools can and cannot influence. And, these variables are difficult to control in research. As a result, findings (see the preceding section on student achievement) are often contradictory.

A review of the literature on processes of learning a second language* indicates that:

•Repeating the same content in both languages is ineffective, as students are likely to tune out instruction in the weaker language.

•When use of a particular language is not specified according to time and/or subject, teachers are prone to use the language they know best more often. In addition, it appears that clear separation of languages (by time or location or speaker) encourages learning of both languages.

•Learning of the second language can frequently occur with no formal instruction, particularly if instruction is conducted in that language and if there are monolingual speakers of that language as peers in the class who interact with the LESA students (Hatch, vol. 2).

•Personality factors are also important in a person's ability to learn a second language. L.W. Fillmore's recent study (forthcoming) shows the importance of interaction with monolingual English speaking peers as well as personality as important factors in second language acquisition. In her study, the children who were more socially involved and more flexible in approaching new ideas learned English more rapidly than did those children who did not care to interact as much with their English speaking playmates and who were more methodical in their approach to tackling new problems. Hatch (vol. 2) also cites this as an important though often overlooked factor in studies in second language acquisition.

•There may be an optimal time for introducing the second language. Some evidence indicates that students who do not learn a second language until they are about 10 years old are able to learn it better. This phenomenon might, however, be attributable to whether or not students have received formal education in the native language (9). Hatch (vol. 2) cites evidence that certain language skills might be best learned at different ages (but research is needed to determine these stages).

---

* *Note that studies of second language learning focus on a wide variety of children learning another language under a wide variety of circumstances.*

•The longer students are involved in schooling where the second language is the medium of instruction, the better they are likely to perform academically in that language. This indicates that program evaluations should be made of children several years after they have completed a transitional bilingual program or after several years in a maintenance program to judge the effect of the program on second language acquisition or on academic achievement.

•Whether certain subjects should be taught in a particular language is still open to question. Duplicating subject area lessons in both languages is counter-productive; however, there is some evidence that math processes are better retained in the language they were first learned in. Therefore, a student who learns math in English is likely to be more successful in an English scholastic environment which emphasizes national standardized tests in English. It does not imply, however, for example, that a student will not be clever in math if he cannot do math in English.

•Focused attention on and understanding of what is heard of the second language is also an important factor in expanding proficiency in the second language. Rote drills have limited effectiveness in promoting this understanding, but carefully constructed exercises which focus on communication may be more helpful--especially to older students (Krashen, 1978).

•Many factors influence a child's receptivity to learning a second language. Some of these factors include personality characteristics, attitudes toward speakers of the second language, opportunities for interaction with speakers of the other language, socio-economic characteristics of the child's family, etc. For example, the higher the SES, the better the students are able to learn the second language (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa, 1976; Flores, 1969; Tucker, vol. 2; Tucker, Hamayan, and Genesee, 1976; and Hamayan, Genesee and Tucker, 1977). These factors have been likened to a "filter" (Dulay and Burt, 1977; Krashen, 1978). To lower this filter, in effect (e.g., to lower the children's anxiety) is to facilitate their learning the second language.

•The proper sequence of structures for introduction of the second language is not known. However, it is thought that the activity of using the second language--using structures in meaningful situations--is as important as sequence of structures. Conscious control over structures/ability to manipulate is also thought to facilitate learning, especially in combination with practice (Hatch, vol. 2).

Several studies show that bilingual education in general is more effective at teaching English than ESL combined with the regular program. Reports by Canadian scholars such as Swain (1974), Bruck, Lambert and Tucker (1976), Barik and Swain (1974), Genesee and Chaplin (1975) and Polich (1973) show that English speaking students in a French immersion program perform better on French listening and comprehension tests than do similar students who have had French as a second language instruction. Such studies also show, however, that while the command of French by these students in immersion programs is fluent, they do not command as wide a range of registers (e.g. style of language spoken with peers or style used during a formal presentation) as do native French speaking students. A 1973 study of Chinese children in San Francisco bilingual programs and in ESL-only programs revealed that the bilingually-taught children were four months ahead of those in ESL-only programs in reading and were one and a half years ahead of the ESL-only students in math (and five months ahead of national norms).

Hatch (vol. 2) contends that there is little evidence to support formal language instruction as a better alternative for second language learning--that frequency of hearing and using the second language are highly predictive of success in learning the language. Yet, other studies support formal second language training in bilingual or regular programs (as opposed to having content taught only through the second language, as when LESAs participate only in regular English-only classes) as facilitating second language learning.

The need for special or formal instruction in the second language, whether in conjunction with a regular education program or with a bilingual program, and whether it is more effective for students of certain ages, is also debated. Paulston (vol. 2) strongly favors it and cites student testimony for additional support. Hatch (vol. 2) feels it is not sufficient in and of itself and may be unnecessary. Tucker (vol. 2) suggests that methodologies should be changed to take into account the more recent findings in second language and native language acquisition, such as focusing more on the communicative aspects of language learning. He does not, however, deny the need for "formal, integrated language arts components."

Many important questions regarding second language learning remain to be answered. What are the social, psychological and academic effects of bilingualism acquired at different ages? What is the nature of the relation of cognitive development and linguistic development? What parts of a language (first or second) are acquired at later ages (e.g. from age eight and above)? How is a first language which is not the majority language acquired in a majority language area and also in a bilingual setting? How does maintenance of the native language in a majority language area affect the individual socially and psychologically and how does the way the two languages are used affect what the individual learns of them?

Bilingual Education and the Home Language

Bilingual education holds as a basic precept that a child should be instructed through the medium of the home language, and that the variety which is considered the high prestige or standard form in the home country should be gradually introduced, particularly in a maintenance or enrichment program, thus building on the resources and skills the child brings to school. However, numerous problems arise depending on what the language is. For example, some languages (particularly many American Indian languages) are not written, and grammars and dictionaries and other teaching materials have not been developed to make them appropriate for use in an American classroom which stresses literacy and writing skills. Another problem (especially with recent immigrants) is that the students' home language may not be the medium of national communication in the home country, e.g., Estonian immigrants from Sweden or Italian immigrants from Argentina. Thus, in some cases, learning the educated formal variety of the supposed language of ancestry may be tantamount to learning a second language. In a U.S. bilingual program, this could mean that three languages might be taught. For example, some Cantonese speaking students are taught the more prestigious Mandarin and English, while also receiving some instruction through the medium of their native language.

Admittedly, this does not solve the attendant problems of finding teachers who are bilingual or even trilingual in these languages and of finding materials written in those languages. Depending on the specific program, where it is located, the availability of resources and use of that language in the community, local decisions must be made so that the best possible compromise between these factors can be made.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND AMERICAN INDIANS*

Bilingual education poses quite different issues for American Indian people than for other U.S. minority groups. Though frequently categorized by a single term such as "Indians," "American Indians" or "Native Americans" for linguistic and political convenience, American Indians are not a homogeneous group, linguistically, culturally or politically. There are over 400 officially recognized tribes (about 260 in the 48 states and another 200 Alaskan native communities) and over 200 languages still extant. There are numerous other officially recognized groups. In order to exert more pressure on the U.S. Government, many tribes are beginning to join forces to achieve common goals. Despite this, Indian groups are very much aware of their particular histories (including historical and current relations between tribes, awareness of their former territories and the particulars of their relations with the U.S. Government), their cultures and their current economic needs. Seeing themselves as unique cultural and political entities with special rights within the confines of the U.S., they view bilingual education as a potential tool to serve their needs as they perceive them. Yet, federal funding guidelines for bilingual education often run counter to these aspirations.

---

* *I am indebted to Will Antell (Minnesota State Department of Education), Bea Medicine (University of Wisconsin, Madison), John Wabaunsee (Native American Rights Fund) and the staff members of the CAL Indian Education Program for their helpful comments on this section.*

Attitudes Towards Bilingual Education

Usually seen as a means of cultural and tribal affirmation, bilingual education is interpreted in different ways depending on the language situation of each tribe (10). Many groups like the Navajo, certain Pueblos in the Southwest, the Choctaw in Mississippi and the Lakota (Sioux) speakers of South Dakota have continued to use their ancestral languages in everyday life and many children speak little or no English when they begin school. For such groups, bilingual schooling offers a means to preserve cultural traditions and languages while introducing the students to English and the English speaking world. This, in turn, helps ensure equal access to the educational system. On some reservations and in most urban contexts the reverse is true: because the children speak English as a first language, bilingual education may provide a useful opportunity to introduce ancestral languages to young Indians. Many tribes and communities welcome this way of maintaining cultural identity.

Other tribes prefer that their native languages not be used in the classroom for a variety of reasons like religious beliefs, perceived purposes of official schooling and the belief that the native language is best taught at home. Also, some Indians view bilingual education with suspicion because it has been used occasionally to segregate Indians, and is thus seen by them as a means of repression. Moreover, since English is seen as important for economic reasons and for better adjustment of the child, many monolingual English school programs have been designed for Indian students.

Language Vitality

For all Indian groups, language vitality remains an issue of extremely important cultural interest. Many tribes have lost their native language fluency over the last 200 years because of native language suppression by the dominant education and political system. Many would like to see their languages taught in school as a means of reinforcing cultural traditions and asserting tribal identities. Current efforts toward language revival vary from tribe to tribe, depending on who and how many still speak the language, and whether there are means (such as dictionaries, grammars or sociolinguistic descriptions) which can help preserve and teach these languages to community membership. Previously, linguists were only involved in collecting data for their own research purposes and not in helping the tribes from whom they were collecting data. Linguistic research with intensive tribal support and involvement is often needed to develop orthographies (writing systems), dictionaries, grammars and teaching materials. Only recently have linguists of Indian and non-Indian backgrounds begun to give those research areas the attention they deserve.

Funding Problems

Funding of such efforts is always a problem. Few tribes can afford to meet the costs out of their own revenues. Federal funding is the usual solution to the problem, but available funds are not as extensive as the national need requires. Monies for numerous ancestral languages and cultural programs have been provided by the Indian Education Act of 1972, the Johnson-O'Mally Act and the National Endowments for the Humanities and the Arts. At best, such support covers only a small percentage of the requests.

Title VII (The Bilingual Education Act) holds less relevance to most American Indian groups than for many other language minority groups, since Title VII regulations focus on children who speak little or no English. Although many Indians emphasize restoring or maintaining native languages, many Indian children speak English. Further, Title VII is seen by many Indian people as dominated by Spanish interests. The Title VII Office has generally appeared unresponsive to Indian needs, since few Indian language bilingual programs have been funded under its program (11), and only one Title VII materials center has been set up to develop materials for any Indian languages. Most Indian communities feel they cannot rely on this source of funding to meet their children's language needs. Overall, the picture of federal support is uneven, at best.

Role of States

Many states have been unresponsive in supporting special language and culture programs for Indian people, since the role of these states in Indian education is not clear. One reason is that treaties were signed between the tribes and the federal government. States' obligations in such agreements remain legally undefined. Thus, many states traditionally refuse to provide services to Bureau of Indian Affairs and tribally-controlled schools. The fact that Indians in public schools have received little support from states has also been attributed to states' reluctance to fund bilingual programs in general, the dominance of state bilingual programs by non-Indians and Indian programs caught in state-tribal politics.

Other issues set Indian bilingual education apart from concerns facing other language groups. Bilingual education is often used as a means of achieving professional training and status for their minority group membership. Yet, in many states, it has been extremely difficult to get state approval for Indian paraprofessionals to teach in their languages because they are not viewed as certifiable teachers. A notable exception is Minnesota, which now authorizes a special certification category for teachers of Indian languages and culture as well as special teacher training programs in addition to bilingual education certification and training for teachers for other languages to students of limited English speaking ability (12). But there and elsewhere, providing training to potential Indian teachers is difficult. Commitments often prevent candidates from leaving the community, and universities are often reluctant to waive residency requirements or provide necessary extension courses on reservation sites.

Where states and tribes are locked in bitter battles over land, treaty rights, taxation or jurisdiction, Indian education programs receive little support in state legislatures. With this tradition, Indians have not been encouraged to look to state bilingual education programs or other state educational services for support. There is, however, a brighter picture in some states, such as Alaska, Minnesota, New Mexico and Oklahoma. These states have begun more intensive efforts to provide necessary services for Indian people, including Indian language and culture education programs. It might be correct to view this as the "vanguard" of development in Indian education in the 1980s.

Community Control of Education

John Wabaunsee (vol. 3) characterizes the situation this way: "The move toward bilingualism is closely related to changes in political consciousness....The reemergence of tribal sovereignty means that the political atmosphere on reservations would not tolerate school systems that relegate Native American language and culture to secondary roles."

This is not to say that American Indians are very much aware of the necessity for their children to learn English, since most will have to work in the English speaking world. Indeed, most Indians do learn English, and for the majority, it is their first and only language. Yet, ancestral languages are important to American Indians. The issue lies at the heart of one of the basic tenets of American education: community control. The crucial point is that the Indians themselves want to make the basic decisions--to have the responsibility for both successes and errors--over their tribes, their identity, functions of how their languages are used and their education, and this includes decisions with regard to defining bilingual education.

IMPLEMENTING A BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Practicalities

School administrators and other practitioners, educational policy planners, legislators, judges and lawyers, must deal with the day-to-day practicalities of implementing a bilingual program, and they must deal with unknowns in such a way as to make bilingual programs more effective in spite of the lack of strong guidance from research. They must confront such problems as finding qualified teachers, appropriate materials and curricula and developing ways to fit bilingual programs to their budgets and to the demographic trends of their districts (especially when there is more than one LESA group to be dealt with and/or when district enrollments are shrinking). They must also provide an educational program appropriate for the attitudes and aspirations of various groups within their communities, while they face mounting pressures and directions from legislation and court rulings.

Given that a school district, by federal regulation, must meet the needs of linguistically different students, it must then decide which approach to adopt and how to go about implementing it.

Legal Bases of Bilingual Education

The legal foundations for bilingual education currently rest on state and federal legislation as well as on several major court rulings. Legislation gives official federal and/or state sanction or recognition to providing special educational services to LES/NES students. In addition it authorizes funds and establishes ways to administer those funds for helping local districts meet the needs of these students.

Federal legislation on bilingual education centers primarily on the Bilingual Education Act (ESEA) promulgated in 1968 and revised in 1974, the next revision of this act occurring in 1978. The intent of bilingual education as defined in this legislation is to teach English skills while teaching content areas in the native language and appreciation of the child's culture. The Bilingual Education Act established an Office of Bilingual Education within the Office of Education; authorized the establishment of regional resource centers to assist in training of teachers and program planning, development of materials in various languages and program assessment and dissemination of materials; and established a National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education.

Other federal legislation has also made provisions for bilingual education (13). The Emergency School Assistance Act authorized some special funds for bilingual education and also established special regional assistance centers (General Assistance Centers, Type B; sometimes called Lau Centers) designed to assist schools in complying with desegregation and civil rights mandates and the *Lau Remedies* (see below). Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, another federal compensatory education program, also has provided monies for assisting students with special language needs. To assist vocational education students of limited English speaking ability, the "Bilingual Vocational Education Act" (part J of the Vocational Education Act) has authorized funding for materials, teacher training and curriculum development. Parts A and B of the Indian Education Act, Title IV ESEA, are designed to provide funds so that tribes and local education agencies can meet the needs (including language) of both public and Indian controlled schools in order to improve educational programs for these students and provide necessary adult education.

Title VI (see Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act also has been interpreted as requiring equal treatment of students in education. The Supreme Court interpreted it (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974) to mean that equal treatment may also include equal opportunity or access to the content of instruction and that some sort of special services must be provided for students who have difficulty with English. The Office of Civil Rights in HEW has been charged with the responsibility of identifying school districts which are not in compliance with the *Lau* ruling and with enforcing their compliance.

State legislation on bilingual education, of course, varies throughout the country, since states hold authority over education within their boundaries. Massachusetts led state involvement in bilingual education by legislating the first state bilingual education act. Other states such as Arizona, Alaska, California, Illinois, Minnesota and Texas have followed. Many other states (including North Carolina, Oklahoma, Iowa, Alabama, Arkansas and others) have mandated English as the language to be used in schools (Geffert et al, 1974). States' authority over bilingual education (or any special services for LESA students), as with all education is critical, since states have the responsibility not only to provide financial support but also to set up standards for teachers, programs, evaluations, etc.

As with other matters involving state and federal jurisdiction, federal law prevails over state law when there is a conflict between the two. The 1974 Equal Education Opportunity Act put the *Lau v. Nichols* ruling into federal legislation and extended the mandate to all school districts, thus superseding state requirements. This means that all school districts, whether they receive federal funds or not, must provide services to meet the special needs of LES/NES students. At the same time, this act permits a school to hire teachers with appropriate language facility to "fulfill the mandate to overcome the language barrier from its general ban against discrimination in teacher hiring and assignment (Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3)."

Court rulings. In order to obtain needed education services, minority groups have increasingly found it necessary to resort to litigation. This has been most notable in attempts to establish bilingual programs and desegregation. Teitelbaum and Hiller (vol. 3) see this trend continuing, because of minority groups' dissatisfaction with HEW's previous enforcement efforts. Several important court decisions and/or consent decrees which have established precedents regarding bilingual education will influence U.S. education for years to come.

Much recent litigation has followed in the wake of the landmark *Lau v. Nichols* decision. *Lau v. Nichols* contended that students of Chinese language background in San Francisco were being discriminated against because the all-English instructional program denied them access to the content of instruction. The Supreme Court, resting its decisions on the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, found that such a situation did indeed discriminate against the students by denying them, in effect, equal educational opportunity. The Court therefore ruled that San Francisco must take affirmative steps to provide special English services for these students. The decision did not mandate bilingual education; rather, it avoided entirely the question of the best type of services to remedy the situation (14).

Nonetheless, two-and-a-half years later a plan (see Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3) requiring bilingual education in San Francisco was accepted by the court. The Supreme Court declared itself unwilling and in any event ill-equipped to interfere in states' responsibilities to provide specific kinds of educational programs. Yet, the courts may, on the other hand, impose strict standards on local districts in the matters of race or national origin discrimination, and the schools "have the burden of presenting a plan and demonstrating to the court its effectiveness in remediating past unlawful practices of failing to open the instructional program to language minority students (Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3)."

*Litigation.** Two important cases involving LES/NES students' rights to benefit from instruction resulted in bilingual education. In *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools* (1974), the court, finding a violation of the Chicano students' rights to an equal opportunity to benefit from instruction, ordered the district to provide bilingual education following the plan proposed by the plaintiffs rather than the "token" plan previously offered by the school board. This plan also required bilingual education for English dominant Chicanos and Anglo students. *The Aspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education of the City of New York* (1974) case resulted in a consent decree which imposed a detailed plan for bilingual education (focusing on Spanish speaking students) upon the school district. The consent decree, however, did not provide an implementation plan.

> The consent decree, however, applies only to those students who by reason of their English language deficiencies cannot effectively participate in the learning process, and who can more effectively participate in Spanish. Those Hispanic students whose Spanish abilities are equal to or worse than their English

---

* *All cases mentioned in this section are discussed extensively in volume 3,* Law.

> abilities do not fall within the class defined in the consent decree and are not offered the program under its mandate. (Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3)

In the *Rios v. Read* (1977) case, the court ruled that a school district not only has the responsibility to implement an affirmative plan but also an appropriate plan to rectify the denial of educational rights to LES/NES students. Further, the court recognized the importance of quality bilingual programs for these students.

Court decisions have not always found in favor of bilingual instruction. As a remedy to rectify denial of educational rights of culturally different students, bilingual education was rejected in *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver* and in *Otero v. Mesa County Valley School District, No. 51*. *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver* (1973) involved desegregation of the Denver, Colorado, school system. The plaintiffs argued for bilingual education based on the Cardenas-Cardenas Theory of Incompatibilities (see Blanco, vol. 4), which proposes that because traditional mainstream education was developed for White, middle-class English speaking students, it is not appropriate for culturally and linguistically different children for reasons of poverty, culture, language, upward mobility and negative self-images of minority groups. The court rejected the inclusion of bilingual education in the district on the grounds that the Cardenas-Cardenas Theory would impose an undue additional burden on state and local efforts to deal appropriately with minority students.

A major rejection of the plaintiff's rights to bilingual education came in *Otero v. Mesa County Valley School District, No. 51* (1975). The plaintiffs were contending that the White, middle-class oriented school system was a major reason for poor academic performance of the Chicano students. The court, here, relying on the *Keyes* decision, ruled that the Cardenas plan was unacceptable and that the Chicano students' poor academic performance was due to socio-economic factors and not the educational program. Further, the court found that there was little evidence of English language deficiency on the part of the students.

School districts are, however, obligated by federal requirements to provide bilingual education to LES/NES students at the elementary level. These requirements for compliance with federal laws are found in the so-called *Lau Remedies*, a set of guidelines developed by a Task Force in 1975 to assist OCR in determining compliance with the Lau decision of school districts which have LES/NES students. For groups of 20 or more students of a particular language background, a school district must provide one of several alternative educational approaches for opening instruction. ESL is endorsed for intermediate and secondary levels, but is rejected at the elementary level. Bilingual education is recommended as an acceptable alternative, but not required. However, the school district must demonstrate that any compliance plan it offers which does not include bilingual education is as effective as bilingual education.

Although these guidelines do not have the force of law, since they have never been published in the *Federal Register*, they have "weight as an agency interpretation (Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3)." It is clear that school districts may not ignore the *Lau Remedies*, since they are presumed valid and thus enforceable and have also been disseminated widely (see Teitelbaum and Hiller, note 75, vol. 3). Furthermore, holding the burden of proof to demonstrate that any particular set of educational strategies is more effective than bilingual education, a school district is even more constrained to resort to bilingual education for NES/LES students. As the OCR can directly intervene in a school district to press for compliance with the *Lau Remedies*, the *Remedies* do not have to be compatible with state laws.

Because students are frequently grouped by English language ability (and in many cases by ethnicity in bilingual programs), many people have wondered about the interface between the *Lau Remedies* and desegregation orders. The purpose of desegregation is essentially to allow access to the content and services of the educational system to all students, no matter what their race or national origin. It would appear that the two, desegregation and the *Lau Remedies*, are not mutually exclusive (see Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3). Indeed the *Lau Remedies* do not allow segregation or separate treatment. The complexity of the legal issues makes it difficult to prescribe how a school district might comply both with the *Lau* decision and court orders to desegregate, as it depends greatly on the nature of the school district and the desegregation orders.

Costs of Bilingual Education

Among the many questions about bilingual education, "How much does it cost?" is one of the most frequently asked. However, since few cost analyses on bilingual education have been undertaken, and those which have used such different research methodologies, it is difficult to provide clear indications as to what the actual costs (the add-on costs, the start-up costs, or the cost effectiveness) of these programs might be.

Proponents of bilingual education frequently argue that costs, other than start-up costs, should be minimal because a bilingual program which is an integral part of education services would, in theory, require no additional teachers or facilities and that start-up costs would lie primarily in materials acquisition. Such arguments are frequently rejected by people dealing with the problems associated with bringing a bilingual program into a school system, since most of these are "added-on" as a separate program to the regular educational services rather than being integrated into them. (See Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 4, note 112.) Two studies on costs of bilingual education--

one on bilingual programs in New Mexico, the other in Texas (see studies by Cárdenas and García, vol. 4)--do not appear to support arguments for bilingual education programs costing the same as regular programs. The Cárdenas study determined that there are five major concentrations of expenditures for bilingual programs: staffing, materials, library resources, equipment and testing. In this particular study costs varied as to year of program implementation and grade level, with the higher costs being concentrated in lower grade levels in the first year of implementation and the lower costs being concentrated in the fourth year of program implementation in the upper elementary grades.

Many questions regarding costs of bilingual education thus remain unanswered and more research is called for. Little or no information is available on the costs of different types of bilingual programs (e.g. transitional versus maintenance, or alternate-day language use versus gradual introduction of English, or Chinese bilingual programs versus Spanish, etc.), on Title VII funded versus state funded programs, the cost effectiveness for different types of programs or on relative costs of bilingual programs in other states. A comparative study to validate the methodologies of the Texas and the New Mexico studies (see vol. 4) is also needed.

Increasingly pressed to meet the needs of growing numbers of limited or non-English speaking students, school districts are urgently seeking additional sources of funding to cover the additional costs of bilingual education. State funding varies widely from state to state; several states have allocated funds for bilingual programs; other states, where only a few cities have LES/NES populations, no particular state funding is available. José Cárdenas (vol. 4) points out that despite the proliferation of bilingual programs and the increasing tendency for states to legislate and partially support such services, funding has been based "on political feasibility, availability of funds, or the cost of alternate programs rather than a direct and realistic analysis of program costs." As there may be a large gap between state appropriations and additional costs of a bilingual program, districts must look for outside sources of funding (15).

Federal programs, although varying widely in their regulations, are perhaps the most looked to sources, in particular: Title I (compensatory education), Emergency School Assistance (ESAA), Bilingual Vocational Education, in addition to Title VII (Bilingual Education) provide funds which might be utilized to implement a bilingual program. Title VII funding has been directed toward "demonstration" programs (i.e. those programs which are experimental and designed to show how bilingual education can work effectively). Unlike Title I, Title VII funds are not available to every school district which has LESA students because the legislation does not allow a formula basis for granting funds based on numbers of children with a particular need. School districts, especially those obligated to provide appropriate services for NES/LES students, cannot always rely on federal funds to supplement state funds.

When state and federal funds are not sufficient, local districts must use their own revenues which are frequently limited. In some school districts, like those in Texas, which must use property taxes to fund education, it is frequently the areas with the largest LESA populations and thus the greatest need for special services which have the least ability to provide them with local funds. Many districts, particularly those in urban areas, faced with declining overall student enrollments, with concomitant increases in LESA enrollments and reductions in school budgets, may also be hard pressed to find these funds.

It has been argued that bilingual programs require additional expenditures on the part of a school district; even if substantiated, this argument may not hold up in court because of the principle of not denying "equal" rights due to budget constraints (see vol. 3). This principle was upheld in the 1976 *United States v. Texas Education Agency* case involving desegregation in Austin, Texas. It was noted in this case that although the school district was liable for providing equal educational opportunity despite costs, the court must nonetheless determine the least costly remedy which will rectify the constitutional violation of rights.

Although a federal court may not order changes in the way a state finances education, there is authority to order the reallocation of current resources to effect the remedy to assure that civil rights are not being violated: "To allocate substantial resources to sports programs, new furnishing and equipment for administrators, or salaries for personnel not delivering essential courses, but to claim that insufficient resources foreclose instruction in a language students understand, may be grounds for reordering of expenditures (Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3)." Thus, costs may not be used as an excuse for not providing special language services, and the dilemma between state and federal funding practices (for education in general and for bilingual education in particular) and legal obligations on the part of districts and administrators to provide appropriate and adequate services for LESAs is still unsolved.

Incorporating a bilingual program is possible with minimal additional costs if the school district is willing to undertake steps such as the following: make a commitment to support the program; plan carefully for gradual systematic program implementation; make necessary expenditures to get the program started; modify personnel hiring, firing, seniority and in-service policies; and set aside in the budget a position of a coordinator for the program and necessary materials.

Program Design

When a school district has decided to have a bilingual program of some type--transitional, maintenance, compensatory, or enrichment--that program will have several primary objectives. For most bilingual programs these objectives would cover areas such as teaching a second language (usually English skills in understanding, speaking, reading and writing), helping the children achieve academically according to their learning abilities and developing reading and writing skills in the native language. Typical program models which have been devised to help meet these objectives include the following (Blanco, vol. 4).

Alternate Day Plan: one language is used one day and the other the next day and so on.

Half Day Plan: the home language is used for one part of the day; English for the other part (similar to the alternate day plan).

Mixed: some subjects are taught in one language while other subjects are taught in the other language; in some programs the same lessons are even repeated in both languages.

Bilingual Support: used in situations in which there are too few LES/NES students in one language background for the school to provide a full bilingual program; in such programs, resource materials and people who speak the language are identified and placed on call to assist the student through tutoring in subject areas and to help teach the student skills (such as reading, writing and computation) in his home language; meanwhile the student participates in regular English medium instruction.

Identification and Placement of Students

For an enrichment bilingual program, few problems arise as far as determining which students should be included--volunteers or an arbitrary policy can suffice. However, for compensatory programs which assume a deficiency on the students' part, the problem is critical. It is crucial that NES/LES students be accurately identified and placed.

School districts are searching for reliable measures of first and second language ability since they must comply with federal regulations to identify and place LES/NES students. Numerous tests have been developed and many have been field tested. Most tests focus on language dominance or proficiency. The notion of dominance, as used in connection with most U.S. bilingual programs, is based on the premise that language minority students should be able to receive initial instruction in the language they appear to know best (see González, vol. 2). Nonetheless, language researchers generally concur that *dominance* is a rather vague term which is used to identify or label the language a student speaks and understands most readily. *Proficiency*, on the other hand, refers to how well a person can use a particular language in specific kinds of situations. It also refers to a person's mastery of the vocabulary/lexicon, sentence structure/syntax and pronunciation/phonology of that language and the ability to manipulate them appropriately for the situation (16).

Tests which measure language proficiency are more likely to give scores which are more useful in identifying and placing students than are tests of language dominance. However, testing language dominance or proficiency is currently questionable despite the spate of purported proficiency tests on the market, largely because language researchers have not yet been able to determine exactly what should be measured and how in an easy, feasible way (Tucker, Hatch, vol. 2; Woodford, vol. 4; Shuy, this vol.). Moreover, other factors, which may have tremendous impact on students' ability to learn a second language have not been completely clarified. The major problems in defining proficiency from the researcher's point of view are (a) knowledge of and functional use (appropriate use of language for a specific situation) at various age levels for any language, including English, is limited and (b) the art of developing tests to capture this proficiency is in its infancy. So far, the best efforts in this area are rather long tests which require careful and sophisticated administration and time-consuming scoring. Problems result from the practitioner's need for short, easily administered and scorable, inexpensive tests, since school districts usually have to rely on teachers to test numerous children. As Shuy notes elsewhere in this volume, this is a major area where research and the state of the art of language testing have not kept up with legal mandates which bind school districts, and it appears that the gap is likely to remain for some time.

Teachers

Planning for a bilingual program means finding qualified teachers. The question goes far deeper than just finding teachers who are bilingual, although that in itself is often a critical problem. School districts, under state requirements, are obligated to find teachers who are certified or almost certified and who have other important qualifications such as ability to speak both languages in informal situations as well as in teaching (i.e. are able to speak, read and write the so called "educated" or standard forms of those languages); to communicate with the children in the language variety they bring to school if it is substantially different from the standard form; to teach both languages as second languages to children who do not speak those languages, and teach language arts in both languages to those who speak them natively; to know strategies and methods for carrying out bilingual education in the classroom; and to have competence as a teacher in any sense.

Although there is little documented evidence at present regarding which characteristics of teachers are likely to promote student achievement, there are a few studies which have looked at the effects of the teacher variable in bilingual programs. These have been studied in terms of teachers' abilities to use both languages and the influence of the teachers' cultural background and that of students. It was noted in Modiano's (1966) study in Chiapas, Mexico that Indian students taught to read in Spanish by people of their cultural background scored somewhat higher on reading tests than students taught by native Spanish speakers. However, there is increasing evidence to suggest that the teacher's ethnicity has little influence on academic achievement. Weffer's (1971) study suggests that ethnicity has little bearing on empathy with children. She found that Anglo teachers scored higher on indices of empathy than did Latin American or Latin American-descent teachers who appeared to have more rigid behaviors. The nature of these findings has been attributed to cultural factors, since Latin American culture usually exacts more respect from the students and upholds the authority of the teacher in the classroom. Oxman's (1971) work supports this. This study found that students did not perform better on tasks administered by a person of their ethnic background. Oxman suggested that middle class minority group teachers may tend to reject lower class students of their ethnic group more than teachers who are not of that group.

Much cross-cultural research on the effect of dialect and of ethnicity of the teacher on cognitive development has focused on Black-White differences. Hall reports a recent study (vol. 4) on the ability of young Black and White children to recall stories which contained dialogue in both Black and standard English told by Black and by White administrators. The findings support Paulston's conclusions (vol. 2) that teacher's ethnicity has little bearing on children's cognitive development while the variety of language used does. Hall notes that this is in line with the growing evidence in this area. Findings such as these may imply that teachers who are not members of the language minority group, yet who use that language well, may be as effective in a bilingual setting as members of that group who also use English well.

Another variable which might have impact on student performance is the teacher's proficiency in both languages (see Woodford, vol. 4). However, according to Paulston, there is almost no conclusive information in this area. In practical terms, determining teachers' language proficiency in both languages is as fraught with problems as determining students' language proficiency.

Many districts still experience problems with recruiting teachers and using current teaching resources effectively. Team teaching and other ways of utilizing English dominant or other language dominant teachers and utilization of bilingual teacher aides and other paraprofessionals have been experimented with (see Blanco, vol. 4). There is little research on the effectiveness of any of these alternatives. However, specialists in bilingual education generally agree that a qualified bilingual teacher is the most desirable.

In many countries where bilingual education is an accepted part of education, there is no special training for teachers. Because of the lack of emphasis on bilingualism in the U.S. in the past and the scarcity of jobs requiring bilingual fluency, there are few bilingual professional people equally competent in two or more languages--particularly trained teachers--who can assume the positions which the growth of federal and state funded bilingual education programs has made available.

Thus, the development of teacher training programs for bilingual education remains a high priority. Federal funding from Title VII helps alleviate the situation somewhat by providing funds for university teacher training programs (along with fellowships for students who plan to become teacher trainers) and resource centers to help train present teachers to participate in bilingual programs. Neither the content of these programs nor the effectiveness of teachers trained by them have been analyzed.

Criteria for "good" teaching in regular and in bilingual classrooms have been discussed for sometime. Many states, such as Texas, have also adopted certification requirements for teachers for bilingual as well as regular programs based on assumptions about what good teaching is and what documentation (such as university course work in specified areas) will suffice to demonstrate that a person can teach (Troike and Pérez, this volume). However, "good" teaching for bilingual programs has not been adequately defined because it is not known precisely what variables or teaching behaviors or constellations of teaching behaviors and other variables influence most significantly how students learn and how they perform academically in bilingual programs. Without firm direction in these areas, teacher training programs and state certification requirements which will assure that only competent teachers are certified must continue to be based on educated intuition.

Initial preparation for bilingual educators should include (17):

- language (e.g. teaching the non-English language to monolingual English speaking teachers--whether they are Anglo or of the same ethnic background as non-English speaking students, and teaching these teachers English language arts skills if necessary).
- teaching techniques--i.e. preparing future teachers to manage classrooms well, to diagnose learning problem areas, and prescribe appropriate learning experiences for individual children, to use materials effectively, to sequence lessons, to present lessons effectively, and so forth.
- subject content of the area(s) being taught as well as specific terminology in both languages.
- theory and appropriate practices for teaching in a bilingual program.
- ways to handle two languages as media of instruction--e.g. by being able to teach those languages (oral, reading and writing) to the children who do not speak them, by expanding the

native language arts skills, and by presenting content area subjects through both languages.

Curriculum and Materials

A major aspect of bilingual program planning involves the development and sequencing of curriculum goals and finding materials to use to achieve educational objectives (see Blanco, vol. 4). The *Lau Remedies* require school districts to have the same ultimate educational goals and objectives for students who begin their schooling having difficulty with English as for monolingual English speaking students. Many state and local school districts with current emphasis on basic skills competencies will have to focus on similar objectives for students in bilingual programs. Research findings, particularly those on language learning (see elsewhere in this paper), may have important implications for curriculum and materials development in bilingual education.

Over the past decade a wide variety of materials for use in bilingual programs has been developed by commercial publishers and federally-sponsored materials development centers (Regional Title VII Materials Development Centers) (18). However, quite naturally, they have tended to concentrate on materials for the language groups with the largest populations--Spanish and French, and for children in the early elementary grades, since there are more programs for this level of student. Fewer materials are available in languages such as Cantonese and Portuguese. Materials for one (*only*) American Indian language are now being developed. Yet, materials are desperately needed by groups which, though relatively small, are in large enough concentrations in particular school districts (e.g. Filipinos in San Francisco, Greeks and Chaldean Arabs in Chicago, etc.) to warrant bilingual programs. There is also a dearth of suitable materials (both in the native language and in beginning English) for older children. This presents serious difficulties for districts with LESAs from less common language backgrounds and/or which are trying to implement bilingual programs for NES/LES students who enter the school system at grades five and up, in order to comply with *Lau* guidelines to serve *all* LES/NES students no matter what their language background. Thus, they must resort to the use of locally based curriculum development efforts to fill this gap.

Thus there is a wide variety in materials being developed and published. Some are written with both languages treating the same content--one language on one page and the other language on the opposite page. Some purportedly "bilingual" texts are in the native language only. Numerous books on the culture and history of non-U.S. groups are written in English with a few phrases of the language scattered throughout. Others are in the native language. Books on cultural and historical roots of the minority groups often treat the national origin of the group. Seldom is the culture and history of an "American" group treated in depth, even for such groups as the Mexican Americans of the Southwest who have an extensive U.S. history. Many content area subjects such as math or geography have few materials designed for different grade levels in other languages (19).

As Hatch (vol. 2) notes, there is little research to show what kinds of materials are most appropriate for children who use particular learning strategies or how well teachers are able to match materials to students. Selection of suitable materials from among the variety of types and quality of materials poses a problem for the educator. The Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) issued an evaluation of Spanish materials for bilingual programs in 1976. There is no comparable report for materials in other languages, although a national survey is currently being undertaken to determine what materials are available in Title VII programs, pre-K through 12, Indo-European, Asian, Native American, Alaskan and Micronesian languages, what ones are needed and how they reach the classroom.

One significant aspect of materials development for bilingual programs has been the involvement of parents and other members of the culture/language groups. The need for materials has thus involved many people who might not otherwise have been involved in classrooms or at least in an active relationship with either teachers or school administrators, giving the community an opportunity for input into their children's formal education.

Program Administration

Although comparatively few studies have been conducted on what effect administrators have on education programs, particularly bilingual programs, the consensus is that the administrator is an integral factor in its success. Blanco (vol. 4) notes that in many cases, administrators, with varying degrees of experience with bilingual education, are automatically recruited to direct bilingual programs. He goes on to recommend that a program director have competencies similar to those of a bilingual teacher in addition to leadership and management skills.

The role of other school administrators is equally important in bilingual education (Blanco, vol. 4). Their initiative and support (or lack thereof) will encourage or impede educational change or innovation, as in the case with bilingual education. This is particularly true with principals, especially in systems in which they have control over what goes on and how it operates in their schools.

Program Evaluation

There are two types of program evaluation which serve complementary purposes (also see Mackey, 1977; John and Soukerman, 1977): (a) formative evaluation which provides useful information to help a school or school district determine how its bilingual services can serve students more effectively and (b) summative evaluation which provides information on how the relative effectiveness of bilingual education programs can be established.

Early in the movement for federally funded bilingual education, Andersson and Boyer (1970) realized that only outright success would maintain bilingual education as an acceptable educational approach. Careful program evaluation over a number of years is thought to be a key to determining that hoped for success (Tucker, Hatch, vol. 2). Yet, a decade after the initiation of the Bilingual Education Act (1968), we are still far from having an assurance that bilingual education is successful.

Paulston (vol. 2) presents a strong argument that evaluative research based only on assessment of children's proficiency in English does a disservice to bilingual education. She feels that only with additional longitudinal studies which examine: (a) employment figures after graduation, (b) statistics on drug addiction and alcoholism, (c) suicide rates and rates of personality disorders and (d) school drop out rates for students who have been in bilingual and regular programs can evaluation of bilingual education be more meaningful. A retrospective study of students in the St. Lamoert immersion program showed that although approximately equal numbers of bilingually instructed and monolingually instructed pupils continued on to postsecondary education, the remaining bilingually-instructed pupils were better prepared to enter the Quebec labor market than their monolingual peers.

It is essential that criteria for conducting longitudinal evaluations across the wide vareity of types of bilingual programs be developed to permit clearer and more reliable conclusions to be drawn. Without such criteria coupled with carefully conducted studies, judgments about the success of bilingual education in general or about the quality of particular programs will be tenuous at best.

Well-planned evaluations can provide useful information to help the program as it is being implemented (*formative or dynamic evaluation*) and can provide comparative information on the relative effectiveness of a school's bilingual program at different points in time, or with other school programs or with other bilingual programs of other schools or school districts (*summative or static evaluation*).

Mehan (vol. 2) and others propose ethnographic research to provide descriptions which would in turn provide a basis for critical definitions of goals such as "success" or "effective participation in the classroom" and for measures which might assess these goals and clarify the factors which influence them. This would involve studying what actually happens in bilingual classrooms (and regular classrooms). For example, studying teacher-student and student-student interactions, how language is used, which language is used, what children are supposed to be learning and how they learn to display what they have learned in classroom-acceptable ways; and how this meshes with community variables such as demographic trends, cultural patterns, language usage, attitudes and aspirations of the various minority and majority groups within the community. By examining the gestalt of bilingual education, he argues, we might develop better means of assessing goals.

In addition, more reliable and appropriate measures of skills and achievement must be developed to support evaluations. Woodford (vol. 4) cites the need for better ways to assess both children's skills and subject matter learning, along with program assessment criteria to assist in developing more useful evaluation designs.

Thus, given the current proliferation of poor research designs, any reported findings should be questioned and careful, cautious, qualified interpretations of the findings must precede judgment on the success or failure of particular programs or of bilingual education in general. Until evaluation goals and procedures and instruments (in both languages) are more carefully defined and standardized, it will be difficult to draw definite conclusions about the effectiveness of different kinds of bilingual programs as opposed to other types of education programs.

THE IMPACT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

A great amount of public debate focused on bilingual education has ranged from its dire consequences to its great potential. On the one hand, ethnic pride and self-determination are espoused as goals for bilingual education as well as educational equity for language minority children. At the same time much concern has been expressed that it will undermine national unity, destroy the English language, and hold language minority groups back rather than help them into the mainstream.

Since public opinions and pressures, however well- or ill-founded, will have more impact on the future of bilingual education and how it affects society than will rational decisions based on research evidence, it is useful to examine some of the major concerns expressed.

The Likely Effect of Bilingual Education on National Unity

This issue receives perhaps the greatest amount of attention in the press and in general public discussion. On the one hand, there are claims of unity and solidarity:

> *We suggest that Americanism has never been equated with English-speaking....Further, we would point out that not all of America's people arrived here by boat. In the Southwest portion of this country, our ancestors came to America after the Mexican-American War through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Our people became aliens in their own land by a treaty which*

> *proved a guarantee of the perpetuation of their native tongue--Spanish...."But I think the proper and prior goal of the public schools should be to inculcate a full understanding of the child's American inheritance," Mr. Rosenfeld concludes. That is precisely what we are saying. For we would remind him that the American inheritance includes the heritage of many ethnic and racial groups--including the Spanish speaking....* --Raul Yzaguirre, Director, National Council of La Raza; letter to the editor response to Stephen Rosenfeld editorial (*Washington Post*, October 10, 1974)

> *Only when excluded ethnic group members feel that they are part of the nation and that the nation accepts and respects their culture will they be able to become effective participants in the nation-state. Ethnic individuals who are politically and economically oppressed by the nation-state are alienated and focus on particularistic concerns rather than on national issues and problems. When ethnic groups attain inclusion into the social, economic, and political institutions within a nation, they focus on national cohesion and national concerns, rather than on particularistic issues and problems. Recognition and legitimization of their ethnicity by schools and society is a promising way to increase national cohesion and promote effective citizenship in a pluralistic democratic nation (20).* --James A. Banks (1978)

More frequent, however, is the expression of the fear that bilingual education will diminish the cohesiveness of the nation:

> *Meanwhile, in Miami, Spanish is threatening to swamp English completely. Bilingual educators warn that if English-speaking high school graduates want jobs in the area, they will need Spanish as much as immigrants from Cuba will need English. Native-born Americans, reacting against the Spanish tide, are abandoning Dade County. That has led even advocates of bilingual teaching to wonder if old-fashioned assimilation was not a better policy after all. "Does bilingualism lead to separatism?" muses Von Nieda Beebe, a bilingual specialist in Miami. "Is Dade County going to secede from the U.S. when all the English have moved out?"* --*Time Magazine*, February 13, 1978

> *First, it is not clear how educating children in the language and culture of their ancestral homelands will better equip them for the rigors of contemporary life in the United States....Let us concede that bilingualism will do everything its supporters claim*

> *to foster a child's pride in his family roots....Will it not also distract his attention from learning English? Is...the wave which carried bilingualism into public policy--weakening this common American glue and aggravating ethnic tensions and differences?.... But I think the proper and prior goal of the public schools should be to inculcate a full understanding of the child's American inheritance. This is something worth a great deal more public debate than it has so far received.* --Stephen Rosenfeld, Editorial (*Washington Post*, September 27, 1974).

Underlying many of these fears is the assumption that language and culture do not change without overt upheaval. Yet, change is continuous and natural, for no language or culture is static. American culture will continue to change as will American minority cultures and languages. The point is that whether the U.S. encourages or discourages bilingual education, both the overall American culture and the culture and languages of minority groups in the U.S.--as well as the world--*will* change.

The view that bilingual education will weaken national unity rests on the assumption that language pluralism is a major determinant of disunity. Language is but a symbol--a rallying point--used by those who promote unrest on the bases of other causes--religious, cultural, socio-economic or political. Tolerated language diversity in America is no more likely to cause divisiveness than tolerated religious diversity has (one of the main principles on which America was founded). Throughout human history, language has never been the *single* cause of national disunity. Instead, it is made into a cause to symbolize underlying frustrations and feelings of powerlessness, as the situation in Quebec demonstrates. Analyses of events in other nations and of philosophies and currents of educational and political practice in the U.S. illustrate that language diversity probably does not lead to political instability or disunity. At least one province in Canada (21) is permitting native language/bilingual education. There is increasing use of native languages in Spain and Russia--in addition to the official school languages. Mexico, Paraguay and Peru have had success in native language education programs.

Among language planners, ranging from national policy-makers to teachers, there is the wide-spread recognition that the way to make a language (or a specific language form) especially popular among its speakers, is to prohibit its use. (Fishman, vol. 1) Any teacher who makes a major issue of a taboo word takes a great chance of extending and expanding its uses. To forcefully deny the use of a language by its speakers is to give it new importance as a symbol of identity. The forefathers of the United States, as well as planners in many other countries over the past 200 years, have recognized this fact. Freedoms available to U.S. citizens have always included the freedom of language choice. Schools in the 19th and early 20th centuries took this freedom as a matter of course when they offered classes in the native languages of children who did not speak English. (Heath, vol. 1)

Maintenance of different languages is for the individual as well as the nation a way of providing multiple tools for multiple purposes. Many languages maintained by immigrants and American Indian groups serve in-group functions only. These languages are used at home, in the small circle of friends and community associates, or in religious and social events usually attended only by intimate associates and members. The associations with native languages are, therefore, particularly personal, related to primary group associations which are religious and cultural in most cases. Different languages, of course, serve different functions among various groups. Those who maintain their native tongue and learn English as well move between their primary group and the wider society (Fishman, vol. 1).

Some scholars (see discussions in Fishman, Nieves-Squires, vol. 1) believe that compensatory bilingual education will allow the dominant society of the United States to maintain equilibrium. They explain that it is society's way of responding to the dissonance expressed by language minority groups while allowing the established groups in the nation to maintain control (Nieves-Squires, vol. 1). Other scholars (see Paulston, 1978) see the lobbying for and against bilingual education as occurring essentially between conflicting groups striving for power. When members of a language group feel oppressed and denied access to the benefits of the wider society or without any power to affect the decision-making process, separatist sentiments are more likely to occur than when there are multiple languages in the population.

The Likely Effect of Bilingual Education on the Status of English

Some writers, such as Edwin Newman (1975), prophesy the doom of the English language, attributing the cause to rapid social changes (such as civil rights, affirmative action, bilingual education), the generation gap and television. Newman feels these forces have moved the public away from adherence to a single, time-honored language and culture standard. Yet, it is the nature of language and culture to change. Comparison of works of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Dickens, Neil Simon and Erica Jong quickly reveal how the English language has changed over the years. Many of the national languages in use today resulted from their spread by such former colonial powers as France, Spain, Portugal and England. These languages, of course, changed somewhat from their original forms, and since the time of colonization, have changed. Moreover, attitudes toward use of particular languages as marks of educated or politically powerful people change and have changed. Prestigious languages (languages of the educated and dominant cultures) give way to each other: Greek gave way to Latin, Latin to French, French to German, German to British English and British English to American English. Languages in contact are bound to influence each other. The Mexican Spanish in the U.S. today is an amalgam of Latin, Arabic, Gothic, Greek, Mexican Indian languages and English. English itself is a mixture of German, Latin, Greek and French, and in the American Southwest it even shows Spanish influence.

Thus, with or without bilingual education as we know it, the English language will continue this dynamic process. The complicated factors involved in the U.S. maintaining economic and technological "superiority," rather than the influences of bilingual education, are more likely to determine whether American English will remain a prestigious world language and a language for personal, economic and social achievement for both U.S. citizens and citizens of other countries.

Bilingual education and the spread of the use of English among the various language minority groups. Language usage is affected by numerous impinging factors, only one of which is education. Traditional monolingual English instruction has not been particularly successful in teaching English or spreading the use of English in many areas of the U.S. where there is a heavy concentration of speakers of other languages. Changes in language usage occur when it is to the benefit of the speech community. Where there are numerous support mechanisms for native language maintenance (such as a large community of monolingual speakers of that language and use of the language in movies and periodicals and other media), the home language is more likely to be maintained. Students who wish to enter the mainstream will learn English to the extent their capabilities, personalities and social and economic situation require. Thus, the presence or absence of bilingual education alone will not reverse this course. Nonetheless, it has been observed that bilinguals will tend to use the language of wider communication, as long as it facilitates the kind of communication they wish to have. So, in that respect, bilingual education may actually tend to promote English usage, if students have increased opportunity to take advantage of other benefits of the wider society (Fishman, vol. 1).

The Likely Effect of Bilingual Education on the Language Minority Communities

Although bilingual education came about in response to the assertions that language minority groups were not being given equal access to the benefits of education (including the implied benefits of eventual economic and social gain), the minority language communities are of several minds concerning bilingual education. There are those who call for ethnic and language maintenance. There are others who are indeed more interested in making sure their children learn English so that they can enter the U.S. social and economic mainstream. *Time* magazine (February 13, 1978) quotes a southern California junior high school principal who feels that many parents have pulled their children out of bilingual programs because they are afraid their children will not learn English and will not receive a first class education.

Bilingual education has benefitted minority language communities in the U.S. to some extent (Spolsky, 1977). In many cases it has, for the first time, opened the schools to minority language group parents, allowing them not only more opportunity to communicate with school personnel, but also to participate more actively in their children's education by acting as resources in instructional processes, materials development, as decision-makers in program planning and as teachers' assistants in the instructional process. Moreover, bilingual education has provided socially prestigious jobs in education to people of the community because they speak a minority language. As opportunities for professional training and positions in educational decision-making multiply, more language minority people will have access to the middle-class--a factor which has the potential to increase national solidarity.

In some ways, bilingual education perhaps has been more advantageous for the Spanish-speaking people in the U.S. than for other groups. At times it has even been equated with Hispanics particularly since many of the more prominent people in the field and in federal agencies are from this group, and since most of the federal funding goes to Hispanic programs. Many smaller and politically less well organized groups feel that, despite their own acute needs for programs and services, they have not benefitted as much as Hispanics from federal programs and funding.

This recently expressed concern by small groups is indicative of the fact that bilingual education is likely to have a significant impact on cultural and language change within the minority language groups. Since federal programs have been interpreted as fostering greater appreciation of the minority languages and cultures, individual language groups have had to re-assess their own priorities in cultural identification. Is their prime identification with the culture of the nation where the group originated? Is it with the culture of specific socio-economic or regional sections of that nation? Is it with the culture of the group as the community is manifested in various locations throughout the U.S.? Groups, such as the Spanish speaking or the Chinese, whose members differ in national origin, history, culture, language variety and U.S. manifestation, will continue to debate the types of materials to use, whether teachers should be imported directly from home countries and whether to share teachers or materials across groups. To be sure, by virtue of the fact that these people are now living in the U.S. and their children are attending U.S. schools (whether in bilingual or traditional programs), these cultures are bound to absorb some characteristics and values of overall American life and vice versa.

Thus, while bilingual education makes a special point of respecting the home or traditional culture, however it may be conceived, it will not necessarily preserve the home culture. For example, commercial texts may reflect minority cultures through pictures, traditional stories, mention of food or holidays, but they are not as likely to teach traditional cultural values such as the role of women; languages which have never been written will be written so that typical American educational materials can be developed in those languages, changing the culture from an exclusively oral tradition. Depending on the culture, greater or lesser impact and conflict will be exerted. Schools (even those with bilingual programs) will continue to run by American standards: including bells, educational innovations, perhaps less authoritarian discipline, emphasis on competition and individual work and integration of races and social classes. Minority languages, as a matter of course, will change through school influence as students interact with monolingual English speakers in jobs and social activities and as they learn subjects in school, particularly science and technology, which have new terms with no likely translation in the mother tongue.

The Likely Effect of Bilingual Education on the Use of Other Languages in Government and Business

The practical uses of languages other than English are increasingly being recognized, as government and businesses have need of more translators and representatives capable of living and working in environments in which English is not the common language. Ironically, these practical uses of foreign languages were maintained by businesses, professional organizations and individuals in government until near the end of the 19th century of U.S. history. From the beginning of public education in the 1840s until the final decades of the century, many schools with populations of non-English speakers offered bilingual education. By the end of the 19th century, the Modern Language Association initiated instruction in the modern foreign languages in universities and secondary schools. Initially, the force of the arguments for teaching these languages was that they disciplined the mind and taught grammar as well as did study of Hebrew, Latin and Greek. However, within a few years, proponents of modern languages began to argue their practicality, and students would benefit in vocationally-related ways from their study. In the 20th century foreign language teachers have consistently noted the practical benefits of knowledge of several languages. This move to put foreign language study in secondary schools and colleges occurred at a time when bilingual education in the primary level of public schooling had almost disappeared. Bilingual education is today advocated by some (see Cortés, 1978) as a further means of developing a cadre of professionals with proficiency in two languages. This is underscored by recent renewed interest in foreign language education at the national level (22).

The movement for bilingual education over the last few years has also emphasized language rights of all language minority groups in the U.S. This has coincided with, and perhaps resulted in the requirement of use of other languages in spheres outside education, such as population surveys and educational testing for jobs and voting. Federal population surveys have been particularly affected by this recognition of language rights. Owing to alleged undercounts of population and special needs in the areas of health, education, welfare and employment, minority language groups have pressed the Bureau of the Census and other federal agencies to incorporate separate advisory committees for the Spanish-speaking and for the speakers of Asian languages into their operation. Questions regarding national origin, mother tongue, language proficiency (particularly of English) are increasingly being incorporated into surveys. There is also pressure for survey instruments to be translated into other languages, primarily for the largest group--the Spanish speaking, and for conducting surveys in a language the respondents can understand (Parker, 1978). Public Law 94-311, passed in 1976, requires the use of Spanish on federal surveys in areas where there is a large number of Spanish-speaking people.

Voting rights for speakers of languages other than English form another part of this trend toward recognition of language rights. The Bilingual Voting Rights Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-73) provides that literacy in English or in any language may not be required for eligibility to vote. This law also requires that all materials related to an election must be provided in a language spoken by a group which comprises at least five percent of the voting age population and whose literacy rate exceeds the national illiteracy rate (illiteracy is defined in the law as the failure to complete the fifth grade). The implication of this law is that knowledge of English is not a requirement for good citizenship (see Teitelbaum and Hiller, vol. 3).

Another area which is receiving increased attention is that of testing and language rights. As an issue related to language rights most discussion has focused on misuse of tests in cases of racial discrimination. Increasingly the courts and legislation are intervening on behalf of students, employees and others with regard to the nature and types of tests which they must take. Courts have not so much been interested in eliminating the use of standardized tests as their misuse. Use of languages other than English has so far not been a major issue in litigation. Sole use of the English language for tests of citizenship, intelligence, etc., however, has been questioned in several court cases (*Lassiter v. Northampton (North Carolina) Election Board Case*, 1959; *Diana v. State Board of Education*, 1970). Nonetheless legislative precedent for the use of a person's primary language in testing has been established in Public Law

94-142, the Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children. This law provides that any tests used to evaluate or place handicapped children must be racially or culturally fair and must be presented in the child's language. Other federal legislation specifically concerning testing reform is currently under preparation. Although this legislation may be rather limited in scope, especially regarding language and cultural considerations, it could well provide yet another means for federal intervention in this area. Should this trend continue, it is quite possible that more attention will have to be given to language rights in testing as well. García (1978) has identified the use of an appropriate language for the person taking any test as a right which he feels should be accorded to anyone taking a test for any reason.

The Impact of Bilingual Education in Perspective

Research to provide evidence for the viability of bilingual education has not been a high priority in terms of federal spending, and as a result it has not been a high priority among researchers. Plans at the federal level are being made to help rectify this situation (O'Malley, 1978). More work in the areas of language learning, content learning in two languages, testing, programming and individual differences in language learning will undoubtedly be forthcoming. Bilingual education has shown, more than other areas of education-related research, the need for interdisciplinary cooperation to make research relevant and timely for practitioners.

Theoretically, as more is known about bilingualism, first and second language acquisition, the interaction of social, economic and pedagogical factors, the more appropriate our educational services can become, assisting bilingual education in becoming an integral part of educational services, rather than an add-on special program. However, this may be slow in occurring since the institution of American education, like all institutions, is slow to change and is bounded by public preconceptions of what education should or should not be. Often these preconceptions about education which are held as truths are based on partial or incorrect information or false assumptions about culture and language. No matter how much good advice past or future research may be able to give us about the nature of bilingualism or about the best types of programs and practices for educating students (particularly LEAs), bilingual education will always be shaped by public attitudes which influence public education policy. The dictum that it is not so much what is true but what people believe is true holds. Roger Shuy (1975) has observed that researchers must, contrary to usual practice, assess public reaction to their work: "For one thing, no matter how well-motivated or academically sound the research may be, unless the public for whom the research is intended, really understands it, the process [of research affecting public policy] is apt to founder."

Currently under widespread criticism, American education in general will be undergoing many changes. Nonetheless, the recognition that equal programs are not sufficient--that students must have access to the information in those programs, even if it means special language instruction, will surely have a significant impact on the goals and nature of U.S. education for some time to come. The focus of bilingual education on language and cultural resources of American minority language groups may serve to heighten awareness for the need of all students to learn other languages. Carlos Cortés (1978), Chairman of the Chicano Studies Program at the University of California at Riverside, makes an eloquent plea in this regard:

> Likewise, bilingual-bicultural education--a process which builds upon the variety of home languages in our nation, strengthens the identities of children of various cultural backgrounds, and builds linguistic, cognitive, and affective bridges for children in other cultural realities within our pluralistic society--is a vital part of the educational system. It, too, should be strengthened and expanded. The educational system should preserve and foster, not destroy and demean, the multiple human language resources of our society.

We must return to the central concern for students whose home language is not English. Bilingual programs offer these students greater access to educational opportunities than those who are provided English-only instruction. If these students maintain their own language as well as add English while they achieve educational success, they will do so through their own motivations and the persuasions of the community to which they feel a sense of belonging. Ultimately, it is individuals and communities which preserve and maintain languages, not federal and state programs. Therefore, to focus on the erroneous notion that bilingual education will in and of itself foster language diversity or national disunity is to miss the point that languages are preserved by their speakers and associates, not by external policies and programs. With bilingual education has come increased levels of awareness of different language groups in the United States who now have a conscious interest in extending the resources of their languages as well as English. Much of the interest in this extension is the result of increased participation and awareness of adults in the education of their children and a response to the opportunities of achieving academic success provided by bilingual education. Community participation, social mobility, job security, equal opportunity for learning--these are all goals of education. Bilingual education may help achieve these goals, particularly for students who have difficulty with English when they begin school. Furthermore, it offers other students the possibility of enriching their lives through learning a language other than English--for some, such as native Americans or English speaking students from language minority groups, this means the opportunity to learn an ancestral language; for others, it may mean the opportunity to learn another language and appreciate another culture; and for others, it may provide the opportunity of maintaining fluency in a native language. The observations made by Eliane Condon (1974) are still pertinent:

> If any conclusions may be drawn at the present time concerning the status of bilingual education in the United States, it is essentially that its potential has not yet been achieved. However, there is no foreseeable reason why the promise of equal learning opportunity underlying the philosophy of this educational innovation cannot be fulfilled within this decade, through the united efforts of dedicated teachers, administrators, and community leaders. Unless the schools succeed in offering alternatives to present standards of academic excellence, which will be relevant to their multi-ethnic population, the reality of cultural pluralism in this "nation of immigrants" remains questionable, for it is only through mutual understanding--linguistic and other--that the true spirit of American democracy will be freed from the shackles of prejudices, discrimination, and wasted manpower. And the first step toward the actualization of this ideal will be taken when bilingual instruction is awarded its rightful status in the public schools as a legitimate and desirable form of education for all children in the United States.

Some consider a national language policy to be a desirable outcome of the movement for bilingual education. Were a national language policy which attempted to prescribe formulas for the who, when and where of language choices developed, it would not be in line with the traditional stance of the U.S. government on language. Throughout the nation's history there has not been a centralized policy on language matters. Local leaders have made language decisions in response to local needs. However, laws and federal regulations are becoming increasingly comprehensive, touching every aspect of daily living across the country, as the federal government provides more and more protection and greater opportunities for language diversity and if bilingual education gains more momentum, it is only predictable that language will be a factor in these laws and regulations. Equal voting privileges, educational opportunities, equal access to the benefits from federal funding and equal protection under the law are prime policies within which language has only recently been recognized as a factor. Decisions on these matters have been made primarily in response to political, educational and legal factors which are not solely language-based--and language is considered there only as a tool, an instrument to achieve other ends. An official language policy could be repressive to this trend (23).

CONCLUSION

In order to bring about what has been considered by many as necessary educational reforms for meeting the needs of NES/LES people, various groups have requested financial assistance and legal affirmation to support bilingual education. Thus, legislation, federal and state program regulations and court rulings are of increasing importance in determining the nature and extent of bilingual programs. *In combination, they outline who is to receive the services, how programs should be structured, how much can be spent and then require school districts to comply.*

Traditionally, decisions about educational matters have rested in the hands of local school boards, administrators and teachers. However, equity issues and federal funding have increasingly placed these decisions in the hands of those who seem far removed from the local school building. The role of these policy makers is to foster equality--in Heath's words (vol. 1), "to bring the culturally and linguistically different in line with educational standards and economic realities." Yet, as Heath points out, the "lack of definition in policy determination and weakness of direction in development and implementation" has resulted in confusion at the policy-making level over what is to be done about bilingual education. The reason for the lack of definition is the diverse histories and attitudes of non-English speaking groups in the United States toward languages and education and the absence of any historical precedents at the national level on which to draw. Local communities and schools, throughout the history of the nation, have determined the role of languages in education in accordance with local and regional needs and desires. The national government has not controlled the choice of language through a centralized policy.

Education has frequently been directed by motives other than implications from research. Ironically, the current scrutiny of the efficacy of bilingual education by policy-makers, particularly at the federal level, is demanding immediate answers which can only be answered by sound, systematic research over a period of years. The questions not only strike many fundamental assumptions and practices in bilingual education but also in education in general.

Bilingual education calls for information and recommendations for planning which are not yet available to the extent needed by policy-makers (see Epstein, 1977). Having the power to define (or not define) and carry out (or not carry out) bilingual education and to promote its success or failure in meeting the needs of language minority students, policy-makers (primarily educational planners in federal and state education agencies, legislators and judges, as well as local school district administrators and school principals) must be aware of the variables affecting learning and program success as well as critical information and/or gaps in information relevant to bilingual education. The future of millions of American children and the richness of America's cultural pluralism rests on these decisions.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Shirley Brice Heath for her expertise and faithful assistance in the preparation of this paper. My special appreciation also goes to Diane Bartosh, Tracy C. Gray, Rosario C. Gingras, William Leap, Kari Sajavaara (visiting scholar from Finland), Rosemary E. Tripp and G. Richard Tucker (all of CAL) for their moral support and helpful and perceptive comments on earlier versions. Many thanks.

FOOTNOTES

1. Various forms of bilingual education were employed by cultures to permit access to other languages. The Akkadians in 3000 B.C. held Sumerian in high esteem, as did medieval Western Europeans hold Latin and as Arabs still hold classical Arabic. Numerous countries such as Peru, Belgium, Canada and Afghanistan have two or more official languages and require their educated populations to be familiar with those languages for practical, political, social and economic reasons. Occasionally knowledge of one or more world languages is necessary for social and economic reasons for citizens of some countries. (A world language is a language which is used widely throughout the world for communication particularly for scientific and/or political purposes; current world languages include English, Russian and Chinese; formerly French, German, Spanish and Portuguese were considered world languages.) Some U.S. communities like certain American Indians and U.S. Germans before World War II used bilingual education to maintain their native languages.

   For more information on the history of bilingual education and on the types of bilingual programs in various countries, see Ferguson (vol. 2) and Fishman (vol. 1). A more detailed review of the history of bilingual education in other countries may be found in Lewis' (1977) "Bilingualism and Bilingual Education--The Ancient World to the Renaissance."
2. For an analysis of statistics on language use in the U.S., see Waggoner's (1975) "Language and Demographic Characteristics of the U.S. Population with Potential Need for Bilingual

and Other Special Education Programs." A forthcoming report on people of limited English speaking ability drawn from the *1976 Survey of Income and Education* and a 1977-78 revalidation study which is being compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics will provide more extensive statistics.

3. For a discussion of problems associated with language choice, see Ferguson and González (vol. 2) and Fishman, Heath and Seelye (vol. 1). Also see Ferguson, C.A. et al (1977) "Bilingual Education: An International Perspective."
4. See the federal regulations in the Education Amendments Act of 1974, P.L. 93-380, sec. 703.
5. For a discussion of issues in multicultural education, see Banks (1978), Youngblood (1978) and Cortés, Kaltsounes and Gay (1978). Also see Saville-Troike's (1978) *A Guide to Culture in the Classroom*. For more information on the more subtle aspects of culture, see Hall (1977).
6. For other assessments of research relating to bilingual education, see Engle (1975) and Paulston (1974). These two monographs explore at length the seemingly contradictory nature of research findings.
7. See Paulston (vol. 2) for a discussion of Modiano (1966), Rivera (1973), Olesini (1971) and other studies. See Tucker (vol. 2) for a discussion of the St. Lambert program and Cummins (vol. 4) for a discussion of the Irish studies.
8. A rejoinder to the AIR study, prepared by Tracy C. Gray (1978), Center for Applied Linguistics, points out some of the weaknesses of the report:

   > ...this study does not permit us to generalize from the past experience with Title VII or even to specify the nature of the problems in theoretically fruitful terms. It avoids the reality that bilingual programs develop and exist in districts that differ markedly in terms of variability of linguistic needs, demographics, availability of well-trained teachers, adequate curricula, district commitment and level of politicization of constituencies. As a result of this, the report fails to distinguish between the effects of good programs and weak programs, and treats bilingual education as an undifferentiated uniform whole....

9. A case for learning the second language around age 10 (rather than younger) comes from Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa's (1976 and 1977) studies of language learning and school achievement of Finnish immigrant children in Sweden. One of the variables that they do not discuss is the variety of Finnish used in school and on standardized tests in Finland which are quite different from colloquial Finnish (even that spoken by educated Finns). Therefore, it is quite likely

that immigrants who have received some of their education in Finland would be able to perform better using formal Finnish whereas students who have never been in Finnish schools and whose communities do not use that variety (dialect) in normal conversation would not do as well on achievement tests compared to Finnish students in Finland. The same difference also concerns the Swedish that the Finnish children learn to speak with their peers (and in which they may be quite fluent) and the kind of Swedish the school requires. Clearly, this issue must be investigated more carefully before definite conclusions can be drawn. This observation (Kari Sajavaara, personal communication) emphasizes the importance of looking at numerous variables including the language variety used by the community as opposed to what is considered the language of the schools.

10. For more background information on American Indian Education, see relevant articles in *The Indian Historian* and *Wassaja* (the national Indian newspaper), both published by the American Indian Historian Press, San Francisco, CA. Also see Szasz (1974) and Fuchs and Havighurst (1972).
11. "Of the $135 million disbursed by the Office of Bilingual Education (USOE) in FY 77, $3.25 million was awarded to schools serving Indian students. Thirty-two schools received these funds. In effect, less than 2.5 percent of the available Title VII monies were directed toward Indian language needs, 27 Indian languages were involved in the funded programs, leaving speaker interests in over 170 Indian languages not being addressed under current Title VII initiatives." William L. Leap, testimony before the Subcommittee of Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, September 16, 1977.
12. For the Minnesota Plan, see American Indian Language and Culture Act, Laws of Minnesota for 1977, Chapter 312.
13. For summaries of this and other relevant legislation such as the Adult Education Program, Follow Through, Right to Read, see *The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation* (First Report by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to the President and the Congress), November 1976.
14. For further discussion of historical precedents involving language and education as well as a discussion of the *Lau* ruling, see volume 3. For more information on statutes and court cases, see *Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Handbook for Attorneys and Community Workers* (1975).
15. For further information on federal funding sources, see such resources as *The Catalog of Federal Assistance* and the *Federal Register*.
16. J.C. Richards (1978) defines *proficiency* with respect to (a) prescriptive grammaticality, (b) mastery of speech act rules, (c) functional elaboration and (d) code-shifting. This means using the appropriate style of grammar for the situation and other participants, manipulating the content

and form and timing of the utterance and even shifting between two languages or varieties of language to convey the message.

17. See CAL's *Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers for Bilingual/Bicultural Programs* (1974).
18. Spolsky (1977) notes that early bilingual programs found materials from other countries unsatisfactory as they did not seem as "sophisticated" as American English materials and revealed serious cultural and linguistic differences between those cultures in the native country and the U.S. He also observed: "One key force behind support of bilingual education is a kind of regional or local or ethnic patriotism. Materials from another area (of the U.S., e.g. materials developed in Miami, Florida in use in New Mexico) or another country can often be seen as in conflict with this principle."
19. The need for multicultural materials in bilingual, as well as regular programs, may be found in Cortés et al (1978). Saville-Troike (1978) has developed a noteworthy analysis of culture in the bilingual classroom with implications for curriculum.
20. Banks (1978) refers here to including ethnic groups in the social, economic and political institutions of the national society. One indirect goal of bilingual education has been its support of multicultural emphasis on education. Students in today's classrooms have access to a much wider range of knowledge about cultural and linguistic diversity than did students of a generation ago. Many expect this increased knowledge and the opportunities available in some bilingual education programs for English speaking students to participate to expand appreciation of cultural and linguistic pluralism.
21. In Canada, there is a growing population of non-English and non-French speaking immigrants who must be educated through either French or English. In all provinces, except Alberta, there is no bilingual education (as we in the U.S. know it) for the larger language groups such as Italians and Ukrainians. In fact, in Quebec, anyone who does not come from an English speaking family with parents who have been educated in English in Quebec must be educated in French. Thus, groups like the Italians learn French, but not English. Alberta, on the other hand, is the first province which funds bilingual education programs in other languages (Cummins, 1977a).
22. The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies has recently been organized to advise the President and the Secretary of HEW in these matters (*Linguistic Reporter*, 1978)
23. For an analysis of how a national policy might be repressive, see Heath's "Bilingual Education and a National Language Policy," forthcoming.

American Institutes for Research (AIR). Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program. Palo Alto, CA: Author, 1978.

Andersson, T. and M. Boyer, eds. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1970.

Banks, J.A. "Multiethnic Education Across Cultures." Social Education 42(3):176-185, 1978.

Barik, H.C. and M. Swain. "English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study." Modern Language Journal 58:392-402, 1974.

_____ and M. Swain. "Primary-grade French Immersion in a Unilingual English-Canadian Setting: The Toronto Study through Grade 2." Canadian Journal of Education 1:39-59, 1976.

Blanco, G.M. "The Education Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Bloomfield, L. "Literate and Illiterate Speech." American Speech 2:423-439, 1972.

Bruck, M. and others. "Alternative Forms of Immersion for Second Language Teaching." Working Papers on Bilingualism 10:22-75, 1976.

Bye, T.T. Tests that Measure Language Ability: A Descriptive Compilation. Berkeley, CA: BABEL/LAU Center, 1977.

Campbell, R.N. and others. "Teachers' Views of Immersion-type Bilingual Programs: A Quebec Example." Foreign Language Annals 7:106-110, 1973.

Cárdenas, B. and J.A. Cárdenas. The Theory of Incompatibilities: A Conceptual Framework for Responding to the Educational Needs of Mexican American Children. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association, n.d.

Cárdenas, J.A. "Viewpoint: Budgeting for Bilingual Education." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Cazden, C. and others. "Second Language Acquisition Sequences in Children, Adolescents and Adults." Final report submitted to DHEW, 1975.

Center for Applied Linguistics. Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers for Bilingual-Bicultural Programs. Arlington, VA: Author, 1974.

Center for Law and Education. Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Handbook for Attorneys and Community Workers. Cambridge, MA: Author, 1975.

Cervantes, R.A. "Teacher Behaviors and Cultural Responsiveness: Theoretical and Practical Considerations." In Proceedings of the National Conference on Research and Policy Implications, Lau Task Force Report. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1976.

Cohen, A. "A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education: The Measurement of Language Use and Attitudes toward Language in School and Community, with Special Reference to the Mexican American Community of Redwood City, California." Stanford, CA: Stanford University Committee on Linguistics, 1970.

_____. "Innovative Education for La Raza: A Sociolinguistic Assessment of a Bilingual Education Program in California." PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1973.

Condon, E.C. "Bilingual Education." System 4:2, 1974.

Cooper, R. "Research Methodology in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Cortés, C. and others. "Reactions to Chester A. Youngblood's 'Putting Black into Brown in Early Childhood Curricular Materials'." Social Education 42(3):192-194, 1978.

Cummins, J. "The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypothesis." Working Papers on Bilingualism 9:1-43, 1976.

_____. "Alberta Program Promotes Minority Languages." Linguistic Reporter 20:2, 1977A.

_____. "Viewpoint: Psycholinguistic Evidence." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977B.

Dulay, H. and M. Burt. "Remarks on Creativity in Language Acquisition." In Viewpoints on English as a Second Language, edited by M. Burt and others. New York: Regents, 1977.

_____ and others. Why Bilingual Education? A Summary of Research Findings. Berkeley, CA: BABEL/LAU Center, 1976.

Eldridge, M.D. "Activities of the National Center for Education Statistics Related to Bilingual Education." NABE Journal 2 (1):35-38, 1978.

Engle, P.L. The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education: Language Medium in Early School Years for Minority Language Groups (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series No. 3). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Epstein, N. Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools: Policy Alternatives for Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Washington, DC: George Washington University Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977.

Farb, P. Word Play. New York: Bantam Books, 1977.

Ferguson, C.A. "Viewpoint: Linguistic Theory." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "Literacy in Multilingual Nations." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

_____ and others. "Bilingual Education: An International Perspective." In Frontiers of Bilingual Education, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Fillmore, L.W. "Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition." In *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Behavior*, New York: Academic Press, forthcoming.

______. "Thoughts on Non-English Speaking Children and Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Fishman, J.A. "The Social Science Perspective." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Flores, H. "The Nature and Effectiveness of Bilingual Education Programs for the Spanish-Speaking Child in the United States." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Ohio State University, 1969.

Fuchs, E. and R.J. Havighurst. *To Live on This Earth: American Indian Education*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1972.

García, G.N. "Test Encounters of the Third Kind." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Geffert, H. and others. *The Current Status of U.S. Bilingual Education Legislation* (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series No. 4). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Genesee, F. and S. Chaplin. "Evaluation of the 1974-75 Grade 5 French Immersion Class." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1975.

Gezi, K. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Review of Relevant Research." *California Journal of Educational Research* 25: 223-239, 1975.

González, G. "Viewpoint: Teaching Bilingual Children." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

González, J. "The Status of Bilingual Education Today: un Vistazo y un Repaso." *NABE Journal* 2(1):13-20, 1978.

Gray, Tracy C. "Challenge to USOE Final Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs." Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978 [news release].

Hall, E.T. *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press, 1977.

Hall, W. "Viewpoint: Cross-Cultural Research." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Hamayan, E. and others. "Differences in Performance in Elicited Imitation between French Monolingual and English Speaking Bilingual Children." *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 8, 1976.

Hatch, E. "Viewpoint: Second Language Learning." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Heath, S.B. "Viewpoint: Social History." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

______. "Bilingual Education and a National Language Policy." Paper presented at the 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Hymes, D. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

John, V.P. and E. Sauberman. "Educational Perspectives on Bilingual Education." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Kahane, H. and R. Kahane. "The Decline and Hidden Survival of Prestige Languages." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Kloss, H. *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Krashen, S. "The Monitor Model for Second-Language Acquisition." Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics' Final Report to the Office of Education on the Conference on Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching, 1978.

Laosa, L. "The Socio-cultural Context in Education." In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Research and Policy Implications, Lau Task Force Report*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1976.

Leap, W.L. "Background Considerations for Federal Support of Bilingual/Bicultural Programs." Testimony before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, September 16, 1977.

Leibowitz, A.H. "Language as a Means of Social Control: The United States Experience." Paper prepared for the 8th World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, 1974.

Lewis, E.G. "Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: The Ancient World to the Renaissance." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Leyba, C.F. "Research in Progress: Spotlight on Santa Fe, N.M." *Forum* 1:3, 1978.

Mackey, W.F. "The Evaluation of Bilingual Education." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Macnamera, J. *Bilingualism in Primary Education*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

McDermott, R.P. "The Cultural Context of Learning to Read." In *Issues in Evaluating Reading* (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Linguistics and Reading Series, No. 1), edited by Stanley F. Wanat. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Mehan, H. "Viewpoint: Ethnography." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Modiano, N. "Reading Comprehension in the National Language: A Comparative Study of Bilingual and All-Spanish Approaches to Reading Instruction in Selected Indian Schools in the Highlands of Chiapas, Mexico." PhD dissertation, New York University, 1966.

Newman, E. *Strictly Speaking*. New York: Warner Books, 1975.

Nieves-Squires, S. "Viewpoint: Anthropology." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

O'Malley, J.M. "Mandated Research and Clearinghouse Activities in Bilingual Education." *NABE Journal* 2(1):25-29, 1978.

Oxman, W.G. "The Effects of Ethnic Identity of Experimenter, Language of Experimental Task, and Bilingual vs. Non-Bilingual School Attendance on the Verbal Task Performance of Bilingual Children of Puerto Rican Background." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Fordham University, 1971.

Parker, L.L. "On the Need for Consensus Translation." *Linguistic Reporter* 20:8, 1978.

Paulston, C.B. *Implications of Language Learning Theory for Language Planning: Concerns in Bilingual Education* (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series, No. 1). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

_____. "Viewpoint: Research." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "Theoretical Perspectives of Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1978.

Polich, E. "Report on the Evaluation of the Lower Elementary French Immersion Program through Grade 3, 1971-73." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1973.

Ramírez, M., III, and A. Castañeda. *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development, and Education*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rivera, E. "Academic Achievement, Bi-Cultural Attitudes and Self-Concepts of Pupils in Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Programs." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Fordham University, 1973.

Rosenfeld, S. "Bilingualism and the Melting Pot." *The Washington Post*, September 27, 1974.

Saville-Troike, M. *A Guide to Culture in the Classroom*. Arlington, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1978.

_____ and R.C. Troike. *A Handbook of Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1971.

Schumann, J. "The Aculturation Model for Second-Language Acquisition." Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics' Final Report to the Office of Education on the Conference on Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching, 1978.

Seelye, N.H. and others. "Do Bilingual Education Programs Inhibit English Language Achievement? A Report on an Illinois Experiment." Paper presented at the 7th Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1973.

Shuy, R.W. "Variability and the Public Image of Language." Paper presented at NWAVE IV, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, 1975.

_____. "Toward a Cross-Disciplinary View of Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Silverman, R.S. and others. *Oral Language Tests for Bilingual Students: An Evaluation of Language Dominance and Proficiency Instruments*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1976.

Skoczylas, V. "An Evaluation of Some Cognitive and Affective Aspects of a Spanish-English Bilingual Education Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of New Mexico, 1972.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and P. Toukomaa. *Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Sociocultural Situation of the Migrant Family*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, 1976.

Spolsky, B. "The Establishment of Language Education Policy in Multilingual Societies." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____ and R. Cooper, eds. *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Swain, M. "French Immersion Programs Across Canada." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 31:117-129, 1974.

Szasz, M. *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination, 1928-1973*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Teitelbaum, H. and R. Hiller. "The Legal Perspective." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 3*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Time Magazine. "The Three R's in 70 Tongues: Debating the Uses of Bilingual Education." February 13, 1978, p. 65.

Torrance, E.P. and others. "Creative Functioning of Monolingual and Bilingual Children in Singapore." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 61:72-75, 1970.

Toukomaa, P. and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. "The Intensive Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Migrant Children at Pre-school Age." Tampere, Finland: Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere *Tutkimuksia Research Reports*, 1977.

Treviño, B.A.G. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of a Bilingual Program in the Teaching of Mathematics in the Primary Grades." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1969.

Troike, R.C. and E. Pérez. "Bilingual Education at the Crossroads." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Trueba, H.T., comp. *Bilingual Bicultural Education for Spanish Speaking in the United States: A Preliminary Bibliography*. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing Co., 1977.

Tsushima, W.T. and T.P. Hogan. "Verbal Ability and School Achievement of Bilingual and Monolingual Children of Different Ages." Journal of Educational Research 68:349-353, 1975.

Tucker, G.R. "The Development of Reading Skills within a Bilingual Education Program." In Language and Reading, edited by S.S. Smiley and J.C. Towner. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College, 1975.

_____. "The Linguistic Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____ and G.A. Cziko. "The Role of Evaluation in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

_____ and others. "Affective, Cognitive and Social Factors in Second Language Acquisition." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:214-226, 1976.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education (Clearinghouse Publication No. 51). Washington, DC: USGPO, 1975.

U.S. Office of Education. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation. Washington, DC: Author, 1976.

Velasquez, G.J. "Evaluation of a Bilingual Bicultural Education Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], United States International University, 1973.

Wabaunsee, A.J. "Addendum: Native American Viewpoint." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 3. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Waggoner, D. "Language and Demographic Characteristics of the U.S. Population with Potential Need for Bilingual Education and Other Special Education Programs." ED 146 805.* July, 1975.

Weffer, R.C.E. "The Effects of First Language Instruction in Academic and Psychological Development of Bilingual Children." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Illinois Institute of Technology, 1972.

Weinreich, U. Languages in Contact. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Weinstein, B. "Viewpoint: Political Science." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Woodford, P. "Viewpoint: The Importance of Testing." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Yzaguirre, R. "Letter to the Editor." The Washington Post, October 10, 1974.

Youngblood, C.A. "Putting Black into Brown in Early Childhood Curricular Materials." Social Education 42(3):188-200, 1978.

---

* *Documents identified by an ED number may be read on microfiche at an ERIC library collection or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.*

At the Crossroads

Rudolph C. Troike & Ernest Pérez

INTRODUCTION

As federally and statutorily supported bilingual education (under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) begins its second decade, with 425 programs in 69 languages, it seems an appropriate time to take stock and consider the possible future direction of this important movement. The present is a time of great ferment: the remarkable growth of federal funding for bilingual school programs is reaching its peak and efforts to consolidate gains and improve quality are being initiated by decision-makers at all levels; while, at the same time, the national mood of support is beginning to shift to one of questioning, and the past decade's record of achievement is being examined.

The picture may be likened to the familiar one of the drop of water in the pond--the ripples are spreading widely in all directions with some now bouncing back and impinging on the original area. Having brought about an awareness of the language situation of children from non-English speaking backgrounds, bilingual education has created Congressional, judicial and administrative sensitivity to needs in other diverse areas (i.e. voting rights, the delivery of health services, consumer education, manpower training, legal rights and the population census and other surveys), and stimulated a limited amount of political support among affected ethnic groups--primarily the Hispanics. Court actions--most notably *Lau vs. Nichols* and other cases--have recognized language factors, but school programs mandated by these decisions and state legislative actions are, in fact, overtaking the number of discretionary programs supported under the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII). All of this is happening while the quality of programs that have been created under the

---

Author's Note: The writers especially express their appreciation to L. Leann Parker for her painstaking assistance in the lengthy process of editing this paper.

Bilingual Education Act and bilingual education itself are being questioned.

THE FEDERAL PICTURE

The history of U.S. bilingual education interestingly reflects how educational decisions are often made in this country. It also reveals the frequent lack of coherent planning or consultation with relevant sources of expertise in the decision process. Many of the present problems in the field can be traced to these shortcomings and will undoubtedly not be overcome until they have been remedied.

The original Bilingual Education Act, signed into law by President Johnson in January 1968, funded programs on the basis of proposals submitted to the Office of Education, for initiation the following September. Despite the fact that bilingual education was one of the most demandingly innovative programs ever enacted, most programs had little or no provision for teacher training or materials development. Indeed, during that first year teachers did well to keep a day ahead of students in their preparation. If students in these early programs often received less than optimum instruction, it is small wonder, since--somewhat paradoxically--the U.S. Office of Education, which had been supporting summer training institutes in bilingual education under the National Defense Education Act, phased out that program just at that time.

Although some materials development and local in-service training for teachers were permitted under the 1968 legislation, it was not until the passage of the Educational Amendments of 1974 (Schneider, 1977) that funding was authorized for (a) teacher training, including training for teacher trainers, (b) materials development, (c) a national information clearinghouse and (d) research. Unfortunately, the quality of teacher and teacher-trainer preparation programs funded under Title VII has remained quite uneven. Many programs which have received funding are mediocre or worse (in several instances, these programs did not receive state approval), while other programs strongly staffed with internationally recognized scholars have failed to receive support.

Several states have established credentialing requirements (1), and the Office of Bilingual Education is issuing national guidelines for teacher training, but competent teachers in bilingual classrooms can only be assured if these requirements are sufficiently stringent and are taken seriously by universities and school districts. Since colleges and universities have not kept up with the demands, "hurry up" programs were essential for the implementation of programs. Unfortunately, teachers in some states have been certified as bilingual on the basis of as little as 120 hours of instruction in the minority language--hardly a sufficient amount to enable them to conduct classes in the medium of that language. State initiatives, however, have at least filled a void created by the lack of support from colleges and universities. There is a need for re-evaluation of teacher certification programs, and two factors are important--the short and long term needs. More involvement is clearly needed from institutions of higher education to provide quality teachers for the future.

Also as a result of the 1974 legislation, materials development centers came into being. Yet, the expenditure of millions of dollars has thus far produced only a small quantity of materials which are frequently lacking in any organized design or research base. Much of this situation may be attributed to the fact that in only very few instances have outside specialists such as linguists been brought into the development process. Such omissions would be unthinkable in most other countries (e.g. in Mexico, Peru or Australia). Some centers have done much better than others, and the situation is gradually improving as experience is gained, but experience is a costly teacher and the need for soundly designed, well researched materials remains urgent. The Title VII Dissemination Centers and Training Resource Centers are currently expanding their efforts to pilot and field test materials, but the failure of the Office of Bilingual Education to coordinate with the states has impeded the adoption of materials.

Until recently, there has been little awareness of the great need for basic research to provide a foundation for materials development, assessment and curriculum design in bilingual education. A 1969 USOE conference developed a plan of research priorities, but no action was ever taken on it. The National Institute of Education (NIE) has spent a great deal of effort to determine research priorities, and is continuing to do so, though little direct research has been funded as a result. The Administration for Children, Youth and Families (formerly the Office of Child Development) held a conference on research priorities in 1976 and is currently supporting some operational research, but little basic research. And, although the 1974 amendments to the Bilingual Education Act authorized support for research, no funds for that purpose were requested in the budget by the Office of Bilingual Education until 1977. Increased funds will become available during 1978, and additional funds have been requested for the following year. An unplanned, serendipitous source of research activity will emerge over the next several years as the large number of MA and PhD fellows being supported under Title VII funds conduct research for their theses and dissertations, although these will necessarily be mainly of a microcosmic nature and will not meet the need for larger integrative studies (Fishman, 1977). Thus, while the future looks brighter in this area, it will clearly be several years before research results begin to emerge and affect the quality of bilingual education programs.

Finally, the National Bilingual Education Clearinghouse, which was authorized in 1974, has only recently come into being after a long gestation period which included regional hearings and a design study to determine the needs to be addressed. The Clearinghouse was established to serve as a vehicle for organizing available information, identifying gaps and redundancies and assisting Title VII-supported technical resource centers, materials development centers and state education agencies to meet the needs of bilingual programs. In addition to addressing domestic needs, it will serve as an information link with other countries in the field of bilingual education. Although the Clearinghouse itself is planned to require two years to become fully operational, with its creation, a national technical assistance system is now in place to support bilingual programs in the schools.

THE ROLE OF THE STATES

Whatever the future direction of federal funding, developments at the state level and in the judicial area are perhaps of longer term significance for the survival of bilingual education. A growing number of states are passing legislation mandating or authorizing bilingual programs. New York, California, Massachusetts and Texas provide state funding, but Illinois leads the country with far more state than federal funding for bilingual programs within the state. State resources have recently been strengthened by the allocation of Title VII funds to state departments of education (the amount ranges from $1,000 for some states to $1 million for California). The growth of state funding is crucial, in view of the probability that federal funding will ultimately be phased out.

Although a number of states are passing legislation mandating or authorizing bilingual programs, provisions are not being made to fully support these programs. This places a burden on local school districts which are obligated to comply with the law, but do not receive assistance to implement and maintain quality programs. Legislative mandates for bilingual education must authorize the establishment of an organization at the state level to administer, monitor and provide technical assistance to local school districts. This organization must have the capacity to provide technical assistance in all areas of bilingual education and the authority to enforce the legislative mandate.

State legislation has been primarily compensatory in orientation (as is Title VII and the Supreme Court *Lau* decision), often specifying a required transition to all-English instruction after the third grade. This explicit fact raises serious questions as to the ultimate goals of bilingual education. To many members of linguistic minority groups, it is seen as both a means of improving the educational opportunities of their children and of legitimizing--to the benefit of their self-esteem--the inherent validity of their language and contributing to its maintenance. While it may do the latter, by more efficiently engendering a command of English and facilitating integration into the dominant Anglo-American society, it may at the same time serve to hasten the disappearance of the minority language and culture. It is partly for this reason that some minority groups have rejected this form of bilingual education as a threat to the survival of their social institutions, and to their very group cohesion.

If the discouragingly slow integration of Blacks into the larger American society is any indication, a compensatory, transitional approach to bilingual education may merely lead to the eradication of minority languages with no improvement in the academic and economic status of their erstwhile speakers. Certainly the history of American Indian groups in this respect gives little encouragement that the acquisition of English alone will serve as a panacea, if other constraints in the larger society--attitudes, job availability, residence, etc.--are not also changed.

Language and Educational Rights

As the review by Teitelbaum and Hiller (1977) has made clear, judicial action and its enforcement have been based primarily on civil rights considerations, and have treated bilingual education as a means to providing educational equity for people of limited English ability. The most significant action in this regard has been the 1974 *Lau vs. Nichols* decision* and its interpretation by HEW's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) as effectively requiring bilingual education at the elementary school level, and bilingual education or special English programs at the secondary level. OCR is in the gradual process of negotiating with certain school districts around the country to bring them into compliance, and a number of special federally funded technical assistance centers (*Lau* Centers) have been created to aid schools in this process (see discussions in Parker, this volume).

The thrust of the *Lau* decision (in the administrative interpretation given to it by OCR) is that school districts are now required to provide bilingual instruction if they have 20 or more students from the same language background who are limited in their English speaking ability and are thereby denied a "meaningful opportunity to participate in the educational program." Assuming this interpretation is not changed or overturned in court contests, schools are obliged to offer bilingual education, at least on a compensatory basis, whether or not federal or state funds are available. No specific time limitation is mentioned, the presumption being that adequate English competence to profit from instruction in English would constitute an exit criterion from a bilingual program. More than any other single development, then, the *Lau* decision may result in the institutionalization of bilingual education as a basic part of American education.

---

* *The Master Plan for the San Francisco schools to comply with this decision--which has been accepted by the Court--is one of the few instances in the U.S. where linguists have been involved in the design of comprehensive school programs.*

THE STATE OF THE ART OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Although 10 years have undoubtedly produced some progress in bilingual education, the development of the field generally has not been cumulative, and the state of the art remains distressingly primitive. As Blanco (1977) points out, there is virtually no published information available on current classroom practices, and the evaluative studies by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) (under contract for USOE) give a rather negative picture nationally of the quality of programs.* One reason for this situation has been the absence of any agreed-upon evaluation standards and criteria. The Office of Bilingual Education recently purged their files of eight years of evaluation reports which had been submitted by Title VII programs, but in any event, there is little indication that these evaluations had any serious impact on decisions regarding the funding of programs (Alkin et al, 1974).

One problem with evaluations has been the lack of comparability between formats, questions addressed or instruments used, so that little cross-program or cumulative comparisons could be made. A 1975 survey (by the Center for Applied Linguistics) of 115 program evaluations showed only 7 for which reliable data on outcomes could be found. Furthermore, most evaluations, which are carried out in standard educational evaluation design, are irrelevant to the content of bilingual education, and accordingly have contributed little to improving programs' quality (Alkin et al, 1974).

Several developments planned or underway promise to change this situation somewhat. The California State Department of Education is initiating a study of quality indicators in bilingual programs, and Texas plans to make a descriptive inventory of program designs and teaching practices as the basis for undertaking a longitudinal evaluation effort. Guidelines for evaluation, perhaps paralleling earlier ones on teacher training guidelines (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974) are needed in an effort to bring about some standards and uniformity in this important area. Additionally, the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education will help by beginning to compile and disseminate information on promising program practices.

---

* *The AIR study has been extensively criticized by a number of informed specialists, but not all of the negative findings can easily be dismissed.*

Even on the basis of the scant amount of research and evaluation data available, it is clearly evident that *quality* bilingual programs can make a significant difference in improving the educational achievement of minority language children, while contributing to the growth of their dual language competence. Unfortunately, the evidence is equally clear that weak programs (as too many are) can retard achievement--perhaps even more so than regular school programs--and may produce children who are semilingual (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1977; Paulston, 1977) and illiterate in both their languages. Unless efforts to improve the quality of bilingual programs, teacher training, materials development and evaluation show significant progress in the near future, it is unlikely that any amount of political and legal support will be able to sustain the movement in the face of widespread adverse results.

Thus, the present state of bilingual education in the U.S. seems rather discouraging, and there is a danger that it will be rejected if it does not soon demonstrate positive results. Nevertheless, even though their effects may not be felt for several years, a number of promising developments can contribute to improving the quality of bilingual programs: (a) the increase in the number of trained teachers, (b) the gradual growth in materials, (c) improved information collection, dissemination and coordination through the Bilingual Clearinghouse, (d) prospects for better evaluation and of special importance (e) the allocation of funds for research. But for these factors to positively contribute to bilingual education, there must be a strong infusion of knowledge from allied areas such as linguistics, psychology, anthropology and sociology, as well as from internal areas of education--particularly reading and language teaching. The tendency for bilingual education to remain self-contained, to resist outside input and to emphasize ideological commitment rather than content, could all act to prevent the realization of the quality which is so crucial to the success of the movement (see Shuy, this vol. for further discussion). Bilingual education has had 10 years to demonstrate its value, and if it does not do so soon, it will simply become another case in the history of passing educational fads that failed to achieve its goals.

ALTERNATIVES

To ensure that the demise of bilingual education does not occur, decision-makers at all levels must carefully examine needs, alternatives and resources, and put the human and educational needs of children before ideology or institutional concerns. In the following discussion, some types of critical decisions, and some of the factors to be considered in approaching them, are briefly reviewed.

National Legislative Planning

As discussed above, the history of bilingual education legislation has shown a serious lack of careful planning. The important issues to be decided require careful policy analysis and research before adequately informed decisions--whether by the Administration or by Congress--can be made.

One issue is whether bilingual education should remain a discretionary demonstration program, funding schools on the basis of competitive proposals (and serving only a small percentage of the students in need), or whether it should shift to a "service" mode of providing funds to schools on an automatic formula basis determined by numbers of children needing special programs (as is now done under Title I, ESEA for schools with students from families below the poverty line). The latter approach, supported by some minority group advocates, would require a 1,000 percent increase in funding to extend the same levels of support to all eligible schools, but would not assure that the children being served were in fact receiving bilingual instruction.

Since it is probably unrealistic to assume that categorical federal funding for bilingual education will continue permanently, and since budget ceilings and priorities militate against vastly expanded funding, a direction which offers the possibility of more effective use of present funding might be termed an "installation strategy." This approach would treat federal money essentially as "pump-priming" or incentive funding, and require as a precondition, the commitment of full state and/or local funding, phased-in over a period of time, to continue the program beyond the end of federal funding. It is a commonplace experience today for administrators to view federal funds (so-called "soft money") as convenient ways to stretch local budgets by adding on programs, and to terminate or curtail such programs as soon as federal funding ends. Unless there is a binding financial commitment by states and local school districts (and an incentive for them to make such a commitment), this will probably be the fate of many bilingual programs once federal funds are withdrawn.

Meanwhile, funding for a limited number of high-quality demonstration, or "lighthouse," projects could continue, with the requirement that promising practices tested in the projects would be disseminated to, and where appropriate, adopted by the installation projects. Demonstration projects would be closely monitored, and have strong research, materials, staff development and technical assistance support. In this way, present funds which are wasted on a large number of poorly monitored and supported programs would be much more effectively spent.

Since the thrust of the *Lau* decision is to require local support for bilingual programs in any event, the effect of such an installation strategy would be to assist schools with start-up costs in meeting *Lau* compliance requirements (a function now ostensibly served by Emergency School Aid Act [ESAA] funds), and help assure that such compliance efforts were more substantively effective than is sometimes the case. In short, an installation strategy provides a means for assuring the successful institutionalization of bilingual education, and combined with a demonstration, research and dissemination strategy, offers the possibility of a superior cost/benefit result in improving the academic achievement of minority language children.

Because the enforcement of the Lau decision, the funding of Lau assistance centers and administration of Title VII programs and centers flow from different offices and authorizations within HEW, there is little coordination and occasionally conflict or duplication. Ironically, school districts which need Title VII funds to help comply with the Lau decision may fail to receive them. The duplication of assistance by Lau and Title VII Resource Centers and the lack of coordination between them are problems which require resolution.

Research

In a nation which supposedly prides itself on rational planning, it is remarkable that over half a billion dollars has been spent on program activities, and less than one-tenth of one percent of that amount on research, which is vitally needed if the quality of programs is to be improved. It should be a source of national embarrassment that U.S. educators have had to look to Canada and Mexico for research results when these countries have spent far less money on bilingual programs.

Long range planning should include strong support for the funding of research, especially basic research, needed for the improvement of bilingual education. Research constitutes the single most important element required for improving the quality of bilingual programs. The content of curricula, individual and program assessment and teacher training all crucially depend on research. Some of this, to be effective, must be large-scale and longitudinal. Other research should be oriented to particular problems or basic research needs. A funding level of 10 percent of total program funding would be desirable for several years to catch up with unmet needs, but it should continue at no less than five percent thereafter. Cross-national research should be encouraged, and at least half of the research funding in any year should be designated for support of field-initiated proposals, utilizing a peer-review system comparable to that of the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities or NDEA, Title VI.

While a limited amount of operational research is necessary, it cannot be emphasized enough that *basic research* is the important need at this stage. Such research must be addressed to fundamental facts about the languages being used in bilingual programs, to the processes and norms of children's learning the native language and English, to the nature of bilingualism and its consequences and to cultural and social factors affecting linguistic development and school achievement. Only such information can permit the development of more accurate language ability tests, improved teaching materials and better teacher training programs. While research on program design factors or direct work on test development may yield some useful results, for the most part it will be of limited benefit at this stage. Improvement in the state of the art depends critically upon new and better fundamental information, and this can come only from basic research.

The following suggested program of priorities for research, both basic and operational, if systematically carried out over the next five years, could have a substantive impact on the quality of bilingual programs, and could ultimately spell the difference between success and failure of bilingual education.

1. Determination of norms for language development in English, Spanish and other languages at different age levels as a basis for determining student placement and for developing appropriate materials and curricula.
2. Study of second language acquisition processes and examination of factors inside and outside of schools affecting outcomes in bilingual programs (linguistic, cognitive, socio-economic, cultural, situational, attitudinal, curricular, instructional, etc.).
3. Transferability of reading skills from the native language to English and the optimum time and methods for making such transfer.
4. Study of regional varieties of Spanish in the U.S., as well as for other languages where appropriate (e.g. Chinese) as a basis for materials, tests and teacher training.
5. Ethnographic research on language use in the classroom as it relates to program models, teacher competence and student attitudes and achievement.
6. Intra- and cross-cultural research to identify cultural elements which need to be included in curricula or considered in classroom instruction and teacher preparation.
7. Planned variation research to study the effect of programmatic variables on student outcomes.
8. Longitudinal studies to determine long term effects of bilingual education.
9. Validation of teacher competencies in training programs and their effects on teaching effectiveness in bilingual programs.
10. Identification of exemplary components or approaches in bilingual programs deserving of dissemination.

11. Study of evaluation designs appropriate to bilingual education programs.

12. Basic research, including sociolinguistic research, on languages (such as Native American languages) about which little is known and which have not been previously used in formal educational settings.

13. Study of extent and effectiveness of coordination efforts among bilingual education programs of local and state education agencies and institutions of higher education.

Evaluation

One of the most persistent weaknesses in bilingual education has been in the area of evaluation. The most urgent needs in this area follow.

1. Research to determine the most relevant and important variables to be measured in the evaluation of bilingual programs, and the most appropriate measures and measurement procedures to use. *Evaluation research* should not be confused with evaluation, and should not be limited to refinement of present models, methods and measures, as these have proven to be fundamentally inadequate. Rather, entirely new approaches (e.g. ethnographic observation) may be needed and should be examined.

2. Development of evaluation procedures and methods which can have meaningful feedback to the teacher and program planner to assist them in improving the program. Even some of the most sophisticated evaluation models presently in use have little such feedback effect, and so contribute little to program direction or modification (Cziko and Tucker, 1978). So-called process evaluations are not connected to evaluations of program outcomes in any determinate way, and the latter are usually excessively quantitative and have little qualitative interpretation.

3. Preparation of trained evaluators to carry out program evaluations. Training should include development of process evaluations which provide information useful to teachers and administrators in program planning; procedures for providing qualitative as well as quantitative interpretations; procedures for monitoring effectiveness of various aspects of a program, including curriculum, goals, teaching and student performance.

4. Long range planning to develop agreement on standard types of data to be collected so that cross-project aggregation of results are possible and to organize longitudinal studies to determine effects of different bilingual instructional treatments over a period of time (in interaction with various background variables).

5. Inclusion of parents and other community members in the planning and application of an evaluation design at the local level. Evaluation content should be sensitive to the concerns, characteristics and expectations of the community, and the possible effect of these factors. This does not mean that cross-project standardization should be rejected, but rather that both needs should be accommodated.

Program directors and evaluators, as well as legislators framing legislation (or administrators preparing regulations to implement laws) can and should take these considerations into account during their work, if progress is to be made.

Language Assessment of Students

One of the most complex and as yet unsettled areas in bilingual education is the issue of language assessment of students to determine need or eligibility for bilingual instruction. Some of the difficulties in this area have been discussed by Tucker (1977) and Blanco (1977) who gives a list of available instruments.

Some of the legal decisions and laws which pertain to this issue have assumed that a simple measure of language dominance is available (or can be readily constructed) and that a cutting point can be easily arrived at which will permit the assignment of students to bilingual classes. For some time, sociolinguists have emphasized that command of a language is not a single competency, but rather ranges across all of the domains and roles which are available in the society. The person who is highly fluent in a language in a home environment may be quite unprepared to cope linguistically with the demands of the language in an educational context; the person who scores perfectly on a test of grammatical knowledge may be unable to perform effectively in a communication setting. Furthermore, fluency in speaking and understanding a language does not automatically imply a knowledge of how to read or write it. As a result, linguists and other researchers are increasingly rejecting the concept of "language dominance" as simplistic and essentially meaningless, and insisting that any measures of language ability must adequately take this complexity into account.

One of the most important observations from the recent research on semilingualism (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa, 1976) is that a *student from a non-English background*, although he may superficially appear to be fluent in English and may know little or nothing of his ancestral language, *may be presumed to be of limited English ability unless demonstrated otherwise*. The adoption of such a presumption in applying the *Lau* decision would greatly expand the number of students affected, and would require the utilization of much more sensitive tests than are now employed to determine student assignment. At a minimum, however, judges, school administrators and teachers must be aware that simple, easily scored tests which measure only such matters as basic grammatical knowledge, vocabulary knowledge, or ability to perform simple (or even complex) communication tasks may not reveal ability to use a language for critical, cognitive operations, and that a single, mechanically-arrived-at score will not magically permit an unambiguous decision as to whether a student needs or would profit from bilingual instruction.

In the absence of any hope for a single, simple instrument or procedure which can meet the requirement for defensible placement (Gonzalez [1977], for example, points out that there is no adequate research base on norms of language development in English, not to mention other languages, on which valid measures of language competence could be built.), multiple measures should be used, including informal personal evaluations by teachers who know the student and the educational and linguistic expectations of the school program. This measure cannot be used in isolation, either, since teacher rating has been found to be notoriously unreliable because of (a) lack of adequate competence in the child's native language to make an adequate assessment, (b) positive or negative values toward the task or the program, (c) degree of experience in making language assessments and (e) differing purposes for which assessment is made. As an illustration of the effect of the last point, one school system in which 4,000 students of limited English ability had been identified when compliance requirements for the *Lau* decision were being canvassed, found over 20,000 such students when federal funds were being sought to support special programs for them.

Curriculum Materials Development

As pointed out earlier, millions of dollars have been spent with very indifferent results. Significant exceptions have been the materials produced for a variety of languages in Alaska and the Asian materials developed at the materials center in Alhambra, California, in which assistance by professional linguists has been sought and utilized.

However, the lack of involvement in the curriculum and materials development process of people with prior professional experience in these areas has been equally significant. It is essential, if the non-English components of curricula are to be meaningful, that they be closely articulated with the overall cognitive goals of the school curriculum, and not left to inexperienced teachers or even nonschool staff to develop in their spare time. It is important that the native language curriculum not be trivialized merely to "folk" content from the native culture. At the same time, care needs to be taken that curricular content is appropriately sensitive to characteristics of the native language and culture, and not mere mechanical translations of the English curriculum.

Curricula and materials should also, where pertinent, take cognizance of the very high mobility rate among some minority populations, and prepare students to the extent possible to move into different school programs, including ones where a bilingual program may not exist. The tendency of bilingual programs to become ghettoized and to operate in isolation from the remainder of the school program poses a serious problem which requires attention by materials developers and curriculum supervision to help counteract.

A related problem facing materials for bilingual programs is that if they are to be used outside a single community or a single state--as they should where possible for simple economic reasons--they cannot be fixed in relation to a particular local or state curriculum. Several approaches are possible to deal with this problem. One would be to produce a generalized series which includes the common elements for all state curricula involved, and provide separate state supplements to cover the elements which are different. Alternatively, and probably preferably, materials can be modularized, so that they can be used in different sequences (e.g. if one state requires coverage of a given topic at grade two and another at grade three), although this approach obviously requires considerable planning.

Too often materials development in bilingual education is conceived as a rapid, short term process, or as a lengthy, but uncoordinated, community-oriented process. The close involvement of informed community members in the development process is important, and should even be required, but it is unfair to the community, and a dereliction of duty by educators, if they force responsibility on the community and fail to provide the direction for which their own training has qualified them. Above all, *quality* materials take time to develop, and require not only competent developers but careful planning and provisions for controlled testing and revision. It is not uncommon for major textbook companies to spend five years in the development of a new textbook series. Adequate time is spent in planning before any writing takes place, and highly competent professionals in the subject area are involved as consultants at all stages. Materials are carefully critiqued while being written, and are always field tested and revised before being printed in final form and released.

Locally relevant curriculum materials and more broadly based materials are not mutually exclusive. The gap can be bridged between the two by carefully selecting and adapting or modifying broad-based materials to local needs and objectives. In fact, utilization of outside materials, particularly those carefully developed and sequenced by specialists in different fields and tested with a variety of students, may assist local districts in their own curriculum planning by providing additional materials and ideas for teachers to use, by giving scope and sequence ideas based on the experience of specialists whom the district may not be able to hire as consultants, by exposing students to other usages of language and other cultural or historical considerations, as well as providing more familiar examples through local adaptations (this is a particularly important consideration in a society as mobile as that of the U.S.). Also, there are commonalities within subject matter: math in Los Angeles is not basically different from math in New York. Broad-based materials rely on this fact. Incorporation of materials in locally developed curricula can facilitate teaching and guide local adpatations. With thought and foresight, both community concerns and input and state-level (and beyond) requirements can be meshed. Training programs to assist local curriculum developers in their efforts to bridge the gap and to make the most effective use of all resources should be developed.

Bilingual education materials, if they are to meet the requirements for equal educational opportunity, should certainly show no less concern for quality. And parents, students, and teachers, as educational consumers, should certainly demand no less.

The Context of Bilingual Education

As has been frequently noted here and elsewhere, bilingual education in the U.S. has, from the first, been viewed as a form of compensatory education designed to enable linguistic minority students to overcome the "handicap" of a lack of English. Traditionally no attention has been paid to the positive aspects of [illegible] acquiring literacy and academic skills in their native language. This national tendency to depreciate other language skills stands in ironic contrast to the value accorded private foreign language medium education by the wealthy in this and other countries, or the millions of dollars spent with little effect on the teaching of foreign languages to English speakers in our schools and colleges. Elites throughout the world have long prized the acquisition of another language, and often undergo great sacrifice to attain it. The failure to perceive the great opportunity which bilingual education offers the monolingual English speaking majority--and the nation as a whole--must surely rank as one of the great myopias of all time.

The fault lies not just with the English speaking majority, but also with the minorities who--although they have often supported the ideal of a two-way approach--have based their political efforts on the compensatory concept of children in need, and have viewed bilingual education as primarily a movement to benefit only ethnic minorities. At the same time, as the full potential of bilingual education has become evident, more and more of those involved in bilingual education have come to support the concept of "maintenance" programs, which extend through secondary school, instead of "transitional" programs, which are compensatory and assimilative in character and terminate when students have acquired sufficient command of English.

Such maintenance programs (which would be better termed full bilingual programs or dual-language programs to avoid the implication of linguistic exclusiveness) offer a genuine opportunity to realize the full benefits of bilingual education. They explicitly recognize the language the child brings to school as a national resource which can form a foundation upon which to build intellectually valued skills, rather than an educational impediment to be overcome. However, if such programs are not to become ethnically segregated educational "tracks," and violate Civil Rights Act restrictions, they must deliberately incorporate native English speaking students. This will not always be easy, as some groups do not want others to learn their languages, or there may be little incentive for them to learn other languages (e.g. Samoan, Tagalog). But where possible, a positive environment which emphasizes the value of advanced bilingual competence should be fostered, so that bilingualism is seen as a source of pride and a desirable goal to be sought, instead of a social stigma or a burden for which the educational system is forced to compensate by the law.

The development of a positive public attitude toward bilingualism and full bilingual education could be aided by several factors. For one, if monolingualism in English could be recognized as a handicap of the middle-class, and bilingualism as a desirable skill cultivated by upper-class elites, it would do a great deal to make bilingualism more socially attractive, and the pursuit of its attainment more worthy of public support in the educational system.

Secondly, if the research were better known that indicates second language learning is more effective when the language is used as the medium rather than merely as the object of instruction, the foreign language teaching profession would be more likely to embrace it as a better way to foreign language learning.

Thirdly, if the strong research evidence that early study of second languages enhances the educational achievement of middle-class students (Ironically, the evidence for economically disadvantaged minority language students is much more mixed.), a significant rationale would be provided for adopting bilingual education for all students.

Finally, as Fishman (1977) and Wang (1977) have pointed out, efforts to develop language competence through the schools alone are probably doomed to failure unless other structures of support exist in the society. Part of the educational planning at the national and state levels should consist of creating and fostering systems of reward outside of the schools which will reinforce the motivation for learning other languages in bilingual programs.

One way of doing this would be to emphasize bilingual competence in federal hiring, a policy which would require coordination across cabinet-level departments, but which would be especially valuable for agencies such as the State Department and others dealing with international activities or the delivery of social services to minority groups. (There is already such a provision in the laws for the Social Security Agency, which is generally ignored.) The same practice could be instituted by states having significant minority language populations, but all states could benefit from such a policy by opening access to contacts and information sources from other countries.

At the same time, colleges and universities could be encouraged to provide incentives and special programs for the graduates of bilingual programs, who would have achieved a level of competence rarely realized by language majors in four years of undergraduate study and should be able to realize benefits from their achievement. In general, competence in an area will be sought to the extent that it is socially valued and rewarded. If the present reward structure in our society--with its underlying xenophobia--can be changed, advanced bilingual competence can become not only the mark of an educated person here as it is in many other countries, but economically valuable as well.

THE FUTURE

Those concerned with the future of American education as well as with the future position of the United States in the world should work to overcome the confines of narrow political or educational interests which in the long run are dysfunctional and inimical to the national interest. What the future requires is a new, global perspective which incorporates educational planning into national planning and recognizes that through the conservation and strengthening of our national linguistic and cultural resources, full bilingual education--in addition to demonstrating our commitment to human rights--can play an important strategic role in helping to assure the continued leadership and security of our nation in an ever-shrinking multilingual world.

FOOTNOTE

1. For example, in Texas, certified teachers seeking bilingual education endorsement must meet the following requirements: (a) have a Bachelor's Degree; (b) have a valid Texas Teacher Certificate; (c) complete a professional level oral and written proficiency in the language of the target population as measured by an examination approved by the Texas Education Agency; (d) must receive credit for 12 semester hours at the graduate level earned after the baccalaureate degree in language acquisition and development, teaching language arts and reading in the language of the target population, teaching English as a second language (including reading and oral

communication) and teaching mathematics, science and social studies in the language of the target population (including necessary vocabulary in the language of the target population); (e) have one year of successful classroom teaching experience in a bilingual program approved by the Texas Education Agency; and (f) must have the recommendation of a college/university with an approved bilingual education program.

Requirements have also been established for students specializing in bilingual education. Students must complete requirements for: (a) a Bachelor's Degree; (b) valid Texas Teacher Certificate; (c) 24 semester hours in an approved bilingual teacher education program which must include Foundations of Bilingual Education (including rationale and program orientation), linguistics (including descriptive, applied, psycho- and contrastive), methodology (including reading and other curriculum content), psychology (including studies in educational psychology --to include testing), culture (including cultural concepts, patterns and regional contributions), language (including studies of the standardized dialects), and language proficiency (the latter two are not to include basic language study or more than six semester hours of advanced language study).

REFERENCES AND RESOURCES

Alkin, M. et al. Evaluation and Decision-Making: The Title VII Experience. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1974.

Blanco, G. "The Education Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Cummins, J. "Viewpoint: Psycholinguistic Evidence." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Fishman, J. "The Social Science Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Gonzalez, G. "Viewpoint: Teaching Bilingual Children." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Paulston, C.B. "Viewpoint: Research." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Schneider, S. Revolution, Reaction or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act. New York: Las Americas Publishing Co., 1977.

Skutnabb-Kangas and P. Toukomaa. Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country *in the Context of the Socio-cultural Situation of the Migrant Family.* Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, 1976.

Teitelbaum, H. and R. Hiller. "The Legal Perspective." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 3.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Tucker, G.R. and G.A. Cziko. "The Role of Evaluation in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Wang, W. S-Y. "Political Aspects of Bilingual Bicultural Education." Paper presented at the California Association for Bilingual Education, San Francisco, 1977.

Toward a Cross-Disciplinary View

Roger W. Shuy

INTRODUCTION

One of the curious things about the way we go about providing education in the United States is that we often operationalize programs--even to the point of legislating or mandating them through court rulings--before making sure that our assumptions underlying the programs are sound. Then, when we ask for proof that the assumptions are valid or for evidence that the programs are effective, the lack of a research base for guidance in programming or for the development of sound program evaluations is admitted. Nowhere is this more clearly the case than our treatment of bilingual education.

In the case of bilingual education, a generally recognized social value was litigated in the courts and legislated into new laws. Programs based on these laws and court mandates were implemented in the schools and were then evaluated by nonschool agencies. This resulted in a recognition of weaknesses which, presumably, fed back into the implementation of programs. This process is not problematic as long as the litigation and legislation are founded on extant knowledge; but, rarely is a knowledge base or a plan for research called for. One might expect the law-related stages--from formulation through enforcement--to be based on known research foundations, since the evidence (depending on the matter being litigated) judged by courts should embrace all of the evidence of the field being litigated. However, this is not always the case.

There are two possible reasons for this situation: one reason may be that we plow directly into legislation and litigation assuming that we actually know how to assess language and culture and that, having assessed it, we have the knowledge, materials, money and training to carry out appropriate and effective educational programs. Such action shows that those who promoted this societal value did not really know that the possibility of effective implementation was, at best, questionable given the limits of current knowledge. Still another possibility is that we know that we do not have such things but that we think we can do a hurry-up job of producing them once the legislation has been accomplished.

Two examples are illustrative of the sort of predicament into which bilingual education has fallen.

The Aspira Consent Decree in New York City

As a result of litigation brought by Aspira of New York, this consent decree was effected in August 1974. The decree specified, in general, that the New York City School System construct, implement and interpret a test of some 250,000 New York City Puerto Rican children in reading, writing, listening and speaking for both English and Spanish in a period of about six months. It was further specified that the test be given by teachers during the regular school period and that, as much as possible, the test be of the paper-pencil variety. Even more interesting is the ultimate goal of this test: "to determine whether Puerto Rican children can most effectively participate in the classroom in the English or Spanish language."

There were several things wrong with this lofty litigation. In terms of education, the litigation did not account for the attitudes and work-loads of the teachers who were expected to carry out the test. Nor did it consider the potential problem which union principles might introduce. In terms of linguistics, the litigation assumed that such language tests already existed or that they could be easily constructed to carry out the goal. Most linguists would not admit to knowing the linguistic aspects of what it means "to participate effectively in the classroom." Nor are linguists very impressed with the validity of current language tests in any of the areas specified. They are particularly confused by the idea of a paper-pencil, group-given test of speaking and listening. Social scientists concerned about such matters as the setting, validity and psychometric reliability of such tests raised other questions concerning this procedure.

Regardless of the questions and doubts of the educators, linguists and social scientists, the law pushed blindly ahead. It may be argued, convincingly we believe, that if the litigation had not so moved ahead, little or nothing would have been done about the problems of New York City Puerto Rican children. On the other hand, this litigation clearly preceded the technology necessary to carry it out.

The Field of Language Assessment

In the case of language assessment, we can see that the field of education is in need of critical information from linguists and other social scientists. A great deal of the activity of the USOE Office of Civil Rights concerns the assessment of the language competence of children of limited English speaking ability. Elsewhere this situation has been symbolized by an iceberg. Visible above the water and easy to observe, are the linguistic characteristics which are usually assessed by educators--vocabulary, pronunciation, small bits of grammar (such as past tense or plural markers). Beneath the surface (or under the waterline) exist the major unrecognized language characteristics such as syntax and discourse. Typically and naturally, educators measure that which is visible and easy to measure. Linguists have not been particularly aware of what is going on in the field of language measurement, tending to leave this area to educators and psychometricians. Consequently, a number of language tests assess such linguistic aspects as vocabulary and pronunciation which linguists believe to be less important than syntax and discourse in language learning.

DISCIPLINARY MYOPIA

This report on the progress of cross-disciplinary understandings in the field of bilingual education is both hopeful and pessimistic. It appears that disciplines establish themselves by attitudes and paradigms. Law is myopic in its concern for legislation and litigation. The social sciences are myopic in their concern for culture, attitudes and social structure. Education is myopic in its concern for delivery. Linguistics is myopic in its concern for language. Bilingual education is bigger than any of its respective myopias.

Whatever the reason for our current myopia(s), the fact of its presence remains. One important ingredient in this series is the effort to correct this myopia and provide an accurate perspective. Increasing the awareness of researchers and practitioners about the state of the art of each field and of areas of potential mutual assistance can provide the necessary foundation for theory and practice in bilingual education, direction in decision-making at various levels and progress in filling knowledge gaps.

Since this writer is a linguist, he cannot speak for what lawyers, social scientists or educators learned about each other or about linguistics as a result of the meetings on which the series is based. He can, however, speak for what the linguists learned about law, social science and education. This learning might be characterized as tolerance or perspective and illustrates the understanding to be gained from cooperation between fields.

The Relationship of the Fields of Linguistics and Law

As a result of the meetings in which the papers in this series were first presented, for example, a number of linguists became considerably more aware of the legal issues involved in bilingual education. Linguists are now more clearly aware that litigation frequently precedes a language knowledge-base related to that litigation. Lawyers want proof. If linguists cannot suggest a foolproof method of assessing language ability, lawyers will use whatever they can find. One of their jobs is to translate court orders into the delivery of services. Another is to be sure that the court orders are realistic and realizable. Linguists have several roles to play in every step of lawyers' progress.

One might ask why linguistics has not provided the answers to such reasonable questions as:

- What does effective participation in the classroom mean in terms of language?
- How can we determine language ability efficiently?
- What are the cut-off points on a language continuum?
- Exactly what are the dimensions of handicap involved when education is presented in a language different from one's mother tongue?
- Does learning a second language affect native language?

For one thing, linguistic research should be able to provide important answers to questions which lawyers and courts ask. That linguists have not researched these questions suggests a research agenda in itself. The linguist with a social conscience will want to carry out studies which will enable the courts to act in a sensible and informed manner.

A second role which linguists must play in their relationship with lawyers concerns the effective translation of what we already know about linguistic aspects of bilingual education. It is no secret that linguists have not been notoriously clear in their exposition to nonspecialists. The linguistics volume in this series points out these major claims. However, it should be noted that this volume (vol. 2) was essentially prepared for and presented to linguists. Although it is an important step toward an inventory of what language specialists have to say about bilingual education, it is only a step.

The Relationship of the Fields of Linguistics and the Social Sciences

To many people, linguistics is a social science, making this subcategory unnecessary. To others, the study of language is humanistic enough to require a separate interpretation as to its relationship with areas such as sociology, psychology and anthropology. Whichever position is taken, the meetings from which this series evolved revealed a difference in perspective which is noteworthy. Two major differences which became apparent were quantitative versus qualitative perspectives and the interrelationship of language and culture.

Just as there is a wide variety of definitions of social science, so there is a wide variety of research perspectives in linguistics. Some linguists do their work like philosophers, some like anthropologists, some like psychologists and some like humanists. In the past, linguists have tended to do their linguistic descriptions and analyses in a nonquantitative way. Questions of sampling, significance, thresholds, etc., were either ignored or treated only marginally. With the development of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, however, came an interest in quantitative matters.

In the social sciences proper, psychology and sociology tended to lean heavily on quantitative analysis, having developed research designs and techniques more finely than anthropologists and linguists had. The latter tended to stress qualitative measurements with focus on a single subject or group in an ethnographic rather than quantitative mode. Such paradigmatic differences in research are, of course, oversimplified in any discussion such as this, but the general polarities of quantitative versus qualitative seem relevant nonetheless.

The bringing together of social scientists and linguists with different research perspectives is enlightening. It is clear that the quantitative people will need to learn to rely less on simply counting things in bilingual education programs and more on knowing the qualitative meaning of what is being counted. Likewise, qualitative people need to be more concerned about generalizability and reliability of the analyses which they find to be valid for individuals of small groups. Many sociolinguists and psycholinguists who already favor quantitative approaches found this aspect of the social science presentations agreeable. Linguists of a more ethnographic bent were less impressed.

The lesson to be learned here seems clear. The myopia which has been claimed to be cross-disciplinary has its counterpart within the social sciences and within linguistics (whether or not linguistics is considered a social science). In this area, then, some of the problems for which the social scientists and linguists should seek solutions include such rather broad questions as:

- What constitutes validity in terms of language diagnosis and assessment (as opposed to reliability)?
- How can ethnographic (qualitative) and quantitative research and evaluation strategies be used most efficiently in bilingual education concerns?
- What constitutes appropriate sampling for determining both individual and group needs in bilingual education?
- What role does attitude play in determining effective bilingual education programs?

The second controversial issue for the social scientists and linguists is more characteristic of the myopia of the entire field of bilingual education. There was considerable disagreement at the meetings about the difference between biculturalism and bilingualism. Some felt that linguistics has little or nothing to do with bilingual education since the main thrust is culture, not language. Others, particularly linguists, disagreed with this position, noting either a parallelism and equality of language and culture or a dominance of language while still others despaired of ever defining (for the purposes of separation, at least) either language or culture. Perhaps the most curious aspect of this controversy was the lack of precision and research evidence upon which positions were addressed.

The Relationship of the Fields of Linguistics and Education

It was noted by several participants in the meetings that the broadest separation between disciplines seemed to be that of education and linguistics. This is probably a result of a rather unfortunate history of the relationship of the two fields combined with an attitudinal distance of no small proportions. The historical relationship is more clear-cut than the attitudinal. A few years ago, the "sky-rocket effect" (Elsewhere I have described the "sky-rocket effect" as the willingness of educators to pick an innovation, pursue it for a few years with intensity, then see it peak and disintegrate.) in education called for linguistics as the most recent candidate for savior in pedagogy.

The so-called "linguistic approach" in reading, writing and language teaching met with a predictable, resounding failure and a resulting hostility between the fields. The supposed friends of linguistics clearly over promised what linguistics could do for pedagogy and, in the process, also did a very poor job representing the best claims of the field. The contribution of linguistics to reading, for example, was said to be in letter-sound correspondences despite the fact that any linguist will explain that there is a great deal more to linguistics than phonology. As a result, linguistics became largely discredited by serious educators--and with good reason. With hindsight it becomes apparent that the friends of linguistics who made such claims were in great error but, by this time, the damage had been done. Many educators came to believe that linguistics had little or nothing to do with education.

The second reason for disciplinary separation between education and linguistics has more to do with academic attitudes. Many educators tend to value the practical and the applied. For some reason linguistics seems esoteric, theoretical and abstract and, for this reason, it is often rejected by educators as irrelevant and obscure. By the same token, education is not highly regarded by academic fields. It is thought to be less serious, easier and less important than the more abstract fields such as philosophy, literature of science. Linguists often share this sort of snobbery and many do not hold educators in high esteem.

Out of such a relationship it would be easy to predict failure in any cross-disciplinary sense. This was not the case, however, for the meetings at least outlined a number of issues and questions in which linguistics and education might shed their respective myopias. In addition to some of the issues noted earlier (the topics for discussion at the meetings were in no way mutually exclusive), the following questions were suggestive of those growing out of the interchange of linguists and educators. There are many others.

- What really matters most in terms of learning a second language?
- What is the role and importance of language knowledge in the process of learning to read?
- How is bilingualism best maintained?
- How does code-switching (between languages) work?

The problems of the classroom are not trivial. The linguists associated with these meetings were probably in sympathy with education in the first place, realizing that research grows out of needs as much as needs seek direction from research. Those who were present, however, were impressed by the willingness of both educators and linguists to seek each others' perspectives and knowledge. The dignity of both fields was preserved and appreciated. There was a clear sense that each field had something useful to contribute and that progress would come only with mutual respect.

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY UNDERSTANDING

Although the preceding discussion focuses only on bilingual education from the perspective of linguists, other social scientists, lawyers and educators could have just as easily written their own versions. It is clear that bilingual education is a complex and multisided matter. No one field can claim it alone. The notion of bilingual education will continue to be seen myopically until the various academic areas which claim it develop an ability to learn from each other. It is not the exclusive territory of one field. It is the combined product of a number of legitimate disciplines. To treat it otherwise is to treat it partially or incompletely. To see it from all four of these perspectives is to see it as it really is, and only then will the needs of the children for whom bilingual education is intended be adequately served.

Thoughts on Non-English Speaking Children

Lily Wong Fillmore

The series of monographs of which the present volume provides a synthesis is intended as an aid for educators, parents and policy makers in their work of choosing and implementing bilingual education programs. The need for care and wisdom in such decision-making is obvious to anyone who has participated in these programs, since bilingual education is vastly more complex than most other education programs. In addition to the usual range of pedagogical problems, these programs confront legal, linguistic, social and psychological problems of a sort that complicate the planning process considerably. Independently of this series, planners have access to many potentially useful research reports and analyses of relevant legal decisions, but frequently these are confusing, sometimes contradictory and offer very unsure guidance.

The present series attempts to clarify some of these issues by presenting research relevant to bilingual education from the fields of education, the social sciences, linguistics and law. The scholars represented in the monographs present the rationales for bilingual education, discuss some of the design issues surrounding it and survey the relevant research from the perspectives of their fields. Parents, educators and policy makers will doubtless find many of these discussions helpful in clarifying and articulating the problems they face, but they will not find direct and explicit guidance for the decisions they must make in planning their programs. The perspective that is needed for making wise decisions, only implicitly represented in this series, is that of the most important participants in the bilingual education program: *non-English speaking children in the American classroom.* Once one assumes the perspective of its potential beneficiaries, it becomes hard to see why bilingual education is as controversial as it is. For these children, it represents a chance to understand what is going on in the classroom, a chance to learn what must be learned in school. In short, a chance to receive what every child has a right to expect from school.

And yet, ideological battles rage over whether public funds should be used to provide bilingual education for these students. Those who favor bilingual education argue on cognitive, social, cultural and linguistic grounds that the education process is more likely to be successful if it builds on what students bring to school from their homes. The curricula of most education programs, they point out, assume a continuity between the language and culture of the home and of the school. Where this assumed continuity exists, students' transition from home to school is facilitated; where it does not, as in the case of non-English speaking immigrant children, the transition is apt to be difficult and traumatic. Since many of the educational difficulties experienced by non-English speaking children in our schools can be traced to this lack of linguistic and cultural continuity between home and classroom, proponents of bilingual education maintain that these difficulties can be alleviated or eliminated by a plan which uses the students' home language in school as a medium of instruction, and by incorporating aspects of the home culture into the classroom setting.

Those who oppose bilingual education, on the other hand, point out that many generations of immigrant children have managed to survive in American schools without the kind of help offered by bilingual education, arguing that these young people were able to enter American society rapidly and successfully because they chose to become assimilated and were willing to work at learning the language. Their argument is that since bilingual education encourages the use of the home language in school, it could have the effect of preventing the present generation of immigrants from entering the economic and social mainstream of American society. Further, because such programs advocate the maintenance of immigrant languages, they might encourage the development of permanent linguistic subgroups in this society which in time could weaken its cultural and linguistic unity. For these reasons, bilingual education ought to be regarded as a dangerous, divisive force, and eliminated.

This debate must surely confuse those who find themselves having to consider the adoption or implementation of bilingual programs. The arguments on both sides seem equally persuasive, and at the same time equally hard to defend. Appeals to reason help little since many of the arguments on both sides are emotional ones.

The purpose of this closing article is to suggest that there is a way to reduce confusion in the face of contradictory claims, by keeping in mind the perspective of the students for whom bilingual education is intended. Whatever ideological arguments might be made for or against bilingual education, none is as persuasive as the purely practical one that can be given in its favor from the perspective of non-English speaking students: *Instruction given in a language we don't understand has* *no meaning for us. If you expect us to learn, teach us in a language we can understand.* The Supreme Court found this argument persuasive when it ruled in the students' favor in the *Lau v. Nichols* case. The court concluded that without help, students who do not speak the school language "are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" and decided that in such situations schools must provide special help to ensure such children an opportunity to benefit from instruction.

The *Lau* decision was not meant, however, as an order to educate non-English-speaking students exclusively in their home languages. Teaching them the societal language--English--should be a major educational objective of any program intended for them. How to achieve this goal while at the same time providing students with instruction in a language they understand has been a major problem for bilingual educators. The problem is one of deciding how to instructionally divide the use of the two languages. The division must be done in a way that makes it possible to achieve the twin goals of teaching the school language and of teaching the necessary academic subjects. While at first glance this seems to be a fairly straightforward pedagogical problem, it is not easily solved because of all the emotional issues involving the use of any language other than English in American classrooms. Many educators, even in bilingual programs, are convinced that English is the language in which the subject matter must be taught if it is to be of any use to the students. They emphasize the use of that language instructionally, relying on the home language only for translational purposes when students fail to understand the instruction offered in English. This practice can hardly be described as bilingual instruction, but that is how many bilingual programs are organized instructionally. The predictable result is that many programs are successful neither in teaching subject matter nor in teaching English as a second language.

How can we avoid mistakes like this in our planning? Again, it helps if we consider the students' needs. The rule of thumb is simple: *If you want us to learn don't confuse us.* This is sound pedagogical advice; instruction should be kept as free of confusion as possible. In courses where mastery of English is the instructional goal, the actual content of the lessons ought to be regarded as a means only, providing something to talk about while the language is being learned. Thus students should not be required to deal with demanding or essential subject matter in early exposure to the new language. Conversely, if the object of instruction is subject matter--science or geography--students should not have to struggle with the language it is taught in while trying to acquire the skills and information they need from the instruction. What is important is that educational planners have clear goals in their own minds on each aspect of the instructional plan--whether subject matter or language learning. The two are not mutually exclusive, of course, and can be effectively brought together. However, it works only if the aims of each aspect of the plan are clear, and if those who are to execute the plan understand and agree with those aims. This is more likely to be the case when all those involved in program planning or implementation keep clearly in mind students' perspectives and needs.

Uncertainty about the aims of bilingual education reflects a lack of clarity, in the minds of many, as to what its purpose is. To many of those in whose hands the fate of bilingual education lies, its sole purpose is remedial. It will, by teaching non-English speakers English, remove the linguistic barriers that keep these students from participating in regular school programs. In other words, bilingual education's reason for existing is to help students *not to need* bilingual education. It is fair to say that many, if not most, of those who are responsible for programs view its purpose as that of facilitating the assimilation of non-English speakers into the society's schools, rather than as providing an alternative to assimilative education. In their eyes, bilingual education is but a step in the quest for a solution to the "problem of non-English speaking students" in American schools.

The search for the perfect education solution--the program that enables all students to learn English quickly and well--is inspired in large part by the belief that in the matter of learning English, unlike other kinds of learning, there should be no variation. A number of special programs have been tried, but only with mixed success; each works for some students but not for others. No matter how ingenious or pedagogically sound the instructional scheme, an enormous amount of variation can be found among the students, both in how long it takes them to learn English and in the degree of proficiency they eventually achieve in its use. In fact, it is safe to bet that the amount of variation to be found--even among students in special programs--is about the same as that found among students not in special programs. For many educators, such variability is an indication that the instructional approach being followed is not effective; it it were, it would work for everyone. Implicitly, the belief is that there are universal solutions to education problems, and once the universal solution to the problem of educating non-English speaking students is found, then all such students will learn English with comparable ease and success.

Whether bilingual education was originally promoted as a candidate for the universal solution or not, it is being subjected to the tests that such a solution would have to pass. Funding agencies, school boards, educators and parents expect it to accomplish *all* that they expect of a *perfect* solution--and at the performance levels. Needless to say, bilingual education has not quite lived up to that expectation. In fact, recent evaluations have shown it falling notably short of the mark. Consequences have been predictable: educators and legislators have begun to question the *value* of bilingual education.

There are even those who suggest that since it has not been proven effective, it should be abandoned.

How to counter such criticisms? One might point out that the teaching of English is but one of the goals of bilingual education, albeit an important one. Of at least equal importance is the goal of enabling children from linguistically and culturally different homes to attend the society's schools without first having to give up their home languages or cultures. Some proponents go beyond this position, however, to argue that only the latter is a valid goal for bilingual education; the concern over the learning of English is assimilationist in origin, and is therefore contrary to the spirit of bilingual education. Having established that perspective, they argue that it is not particularly important whether students in bilingual education programs learn English early or late--the benefits they derive from bilingual education in cognitive, social and cultural areas far outweigh any negative consequences of learning English late. Predictably, considerable friction is created when educators representing conflicting views on the importance of English get together to try to run programs. Because the two positions are irreconcilable, little in the way of clarity is achieved in planning, and the program ends up fragmented and confused.

This is a situation planners are quite likely to encounter once they involve themselves in the planning and implementation of programs. Which position is the right one? Here again the perspective of the students helps in getting through the confusion. From their perspective, the question is not one of ideology--to assimilate or not to assimilate--but of freedom and survival, the ultimate goals of an education. School must do for them what it must do for all children: provide them with the skills, understanding and information the community they live in deems necessary for its adult members. Without these, they will be unable to fill the roles they must fill in their communities as adults. In short, an education must enable them to survive and function in the community of which they are a part.

For most children in the United States the community they live in is continuous with the larger society around them, so that what they need to know for survival in the one prepares them for survival in the other. For such children, education programs which meet their needs can be unitary and fairly straightforward. But a program for non-English speaking children whose primary community is linguistically and culturally distinct from the larger society of which they must eventually become a part, cannot have such a unitary focus. Such a program has the obligation to prepare students to function well in both contexts. It must assist them in acquiring the skills and knowledge essential to their primary communities, and must give them the preparation they will need to move out into the larger society if they choose to do so. In order to prepare students for both, a curriculum will have to be expanded to a greater or lesser degree according to whether the differences between the two settings are great or small. At the very least, of course, the curriculum will have to make it possible for the students to learn English.

It is undoubtedly true that whether or not the learning of English is programmed into the curriculum, students in bilingual programs will acquire it eventually. In fact, with or without bilingual education, non-English speakers in American schools will learn English. The power of the social group is sufficiently great that the non-English speaking students in the American school cannot avoid learning English. Some will learn it very well, others not so well; but as experience has shown, most will learn to speak and understand it in time, no matter what sort of educational treatment they undergo. Is this, then, a suggestion that bilingual education makes no difference at all in the task of helping these children learn English? Should bilingual education be abandoned?

Not at all.

What is critical is not *whether* non-English speaking students learn English or not, but *how long* it takes them to learn it, and what *happens to them while they are learning it*. The strongest supports for bilingual education arise from these two considerations. We cannot take continued existence of variability in how well and how fast English is learned as evidence against the effectiveness of bilingual education. A careful consideration of the sources of variability will show that the quest for a universal solution has probably been wrong-headed.

As noted before, rather impressive differences can be found among students as to how quickly and well they learn English. Some learn enough in the short period of a year to handle its use in instructional settings; others take much longer. It is safe to say that it takes the average student from two to three years to acquire enough control over a language to begin dealing with school instruction given in that language.

For students who learn new languages easily and quickly, not knowing the language spoken at school is not a big problem--only a short delay in dealing with school subject matter. But these are unusual learners; they are the lucky ones who can get by with or without the help offered by bilingual education. It is unfortunate that these are the students that opponents of bilingual education like to use as examples when arguing that bilingual education is unnecessary. Their argument is that if some students can learn enough English to get by in a year, then, if they have to, others can, too. By providing bilingual education in the schools, we make it possible for such students to get by without learning the language of the society they have entered, and so they do not. The performance of the quick language learners is thus held up as a standard against which the efforts of others are to be judged.

The problem, of course, is that most children take much longer to master a second language, and that during this period they are not in a position to profit from regular school instruction conducted in a language they do not understand. By the time they catch up with their classmates linguistically, they are far behind them academically, often so far behind that they can never catch up. So while those who object to bilingual education can point to many students who have managed to survive educationally despite initial language handicaps, we can point to many others whose educational failures can be traced directly to language problems. Bilingual education is meant to prevent the kind of scenario sketched here from being played out again with present and future generations of non-English speaking students.

The variation evident in how fast and how well students learn language can be used as a strong argument for keeping the perspective of the children--the individual students--in mind when planning programs. Just as simple generalizations cannot be reliably made as to how long it takes to learn a second language, neither can they be made on what sorts of instructional help is needed to achieve it. Some students need little more than exposure to the language as it is used by teachers and peers in the classroom and on the playground. By careful observation, these learners can figure out much of what is being said, even if they know little of the language being used. When language samples are properly contextualized--when they relate directly to the immediate situation in which the speech is occurring--the more astute learners will be able to use situational cues for making good guesses about what is meant. What learners must do is to assume a tight relationship between what they hear and the situation in which they find themselves engaged. To the extent that this condition holds in the speech situations to which they are exposed, they have a fighting chance of sorting things out and learning the language. But learners are not equal in their ability to make use of contextual and social information for guessing about the meaning of the language they hear. They can all do it, but it is more difficult for some than for others. Some learners require considerably more cooperation from the speakers of the language they are trying to learn. Speech produced by native speakers serves as the material on which the language learners can perform their "linguistic analysis," leading eventually to a mastery of the workings of the language. For speech samples to serve as useful input in this process, they must be deliberately shaped with the learners' needs in mind. Researchers who have studied the language that serves most effectively as input for the process of language learning have shown that this sort of cooperation is essential (e.g. Snow and Ferguson, 1977). If the speaker is keeping in mind the learner's limited comprehension abilities, quite natural adjustments in language tend to be made, and the language the speaker produces becomes easier to understand. One thing speakers (adults and children alike) tend naturally to do, for example, is to limit the topic of conversation to knowledge and experiences the learner shares. There is also a tendency to avoid talking about topics that do not relate to the immediate situation in which the speech is occurring. There is, instead, a focus on matters that have to do with the here and now, things that the learner is currently seeing and experiencing. And frequently such speech is accompanied by actions, gestures and other nonverbal cues--information a learner can make use of in figuring out what is being said.

Another characteristic of the kind of language that serves efficiently as input for the learner is that, generally speaking, it is structurally simpler than ordinary language. This is not to say that *only* simpler structures are used or that structures get simplified or reduced in unnatural ways (at least not with learners of the age we are talking about), but there is a definite tendency to avoid complex structures and to rely on simpler ones. Further, utterances are likely to be repeated or paraphrased, with small modifications as the learner gives indications of not understanding. This kind of repetition and redundancy is useful, since by paying attention, the learner sees how a variety of structures can serve the same function and thus acquire alternative ways of saying the same thing.

Characteristically, the form and content of language which is appropriate as input for the language learner depend on cues that the learner provides on how well he or she understands what is being said. The degree to which structures are adjusted, and the kinds of adjustments that get made, depend a great deal on the nature of the feedback the learner provides the speaker. Thus, during the period of language acquisition, the learner is being provided with input of just the appropriate level of difficulty, this level increasing with the learner's developing mastery of the language.

This is what is needed by all learners, but how much is needed varies from learner to learner. For the unusually talented learner, sufficient help is provided by the social situation in which the learner and his English speaking companions find themselves. For others, a great deal of cooperation is needed on the part of the people providing the input. Still others seem to require the kind of help which is best provided as explicit instruction in the second language, as in ESL (English as a second language) classes.

Unfortunately, the practice among researchers and educators alike has been to consider non-English speaking students as a simple homogeneous category of learners, the need to learn the school language providing the criterion. Although it ought to be clear that non-English speakers are not all alike in their educational or language learning needs, we tend to treat them as a class, assuming that if what we are doing or providing is sufficient for some students, it ought to be sufficient for all.

Thus, too frequently, neither language input nor instructional programs are suitably tailored to the needs of individual learners, even in programs that are said to be addressed to the special needs of this class of learners. In most bilingual classrooms there is considerable variation among the students, both in the kinds of help they need from teachers and in the degree of proficiency in English they bring to the classroom. Ordinarily one finds a huge range in language proficiency in a bilingual classroom, from students who speak no English at all to those who speak nothing but English. Between these two extremes, every combination of relative proficiency in the two official classroom languages can be found among the students. This kind of classroom language situation is extremely difficult for most teachers, the more so if they realize that what they have to say is going to be used as input for the language learning process. Ideally, the learners in a given classroom should have more or less the same degree of control over the language to be learned. Then the speech adjustments the teacher needs to make can be more or less the same for all of the learners. Everything the teacher says can be properly modified and contextualized so that the students can understand what is being said. The actual content of the instructional program taught in the new language becomes a secondary matter during the earliest period of language learning, a flexibility that is permissible particularly in bilingual programs where at least half of the instruction is being given in a language the students do understand.

But in ordinary as opposed to ideal situations, students vary greatly in relative proficiency in the two languages, as we have said, and it is not so easy for teachers to shape their speech to fit the needs of individuals. For the teacher trying to use English as the medium of instruction for teaching subject matter, such variation is difficult to contend with. It is difficult to make the adjustments needed by the non- and limited-English speakers in the presence of others who would find such efforts unnecessary and boring. The natural tendency for many people is to speak for the sake of those who already understand the language, with minor adjustments made for those who do not. The amount of modification being made in such situations may be appropriate for some learners--those we have described as the specially talented ones--but for others it does not constitute sufficient help for language learning to occur.

To sum up, all language learners need help on getting and structuring the linguistic input they must have in order to learn the language. What differs is the kind and amount of help needed. If the type of instructional program or the language learning situation in which individuals find themselves is compatible with what they need--that is, if it provides just the kind and amount of help needed--then learning is facilitated. If there is a mismatch, then learning is likely to be impeded. This, then, argues for the need to consider individual needs in planning programs for these children as opposed to treating them as a group whose needs are defined by the fact that they do not speak English. At present, they are placed in whatever special programs happen to be available for non-English speakers --ESL, bilingual, combination bilingual and ESL, intensive English, or the like. All of these programs work for some students, but the success of any one of them for any given student depends on whether there is goodness of fit between the instructional approach being used and the individual's approach to language learning.

In planning programs for non-English speakers, what must be kept in mind is that *no single type* of program--bilingual or otherwise--will meet the needs of all such students. Rather, there is a need to consider and provide a range of instructional alternatives to meet individual needs. Otherwise, some students will still be denied their right to an education just as when monolingual English programs were the only educational programs available to them.

These are arguments, then, not just for taking the perspectives of the non-English speakers as a class of students in the planning of programs for them, but for adopting that of the individual:

> *I am an individual. I am not quite like anyone else. I do not speak English, but I am not the same as all other children who do not speak English. I have my own approach to problems, situations and people, and I have unique needs that must be met in order for me to deal successfully with the world of the school.*

This perspective may make the job of program planning far more difficult, but in the end it is the only one which will ensure that the right of all children to a sound education will be protected.

REFERENCE

Snow, C. and C.A. Ferguson. Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bibliography

Adams, M.A. "The Acquisition of Academic Skills and a Second Language through a Program of Total Immersion." MATESL thesis [unpublished], University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.

Alatis, J.E. and K. Twaddell, eds. *English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1976.

Alexakos, M.S. "Bringing Bilingual Education to Budlong: An Analysis of a Culture Conflict." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of California, 1975.

Alkin, M. and others. *Evaluation and Decision-Making: The Title VII Experience*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA, 1974.

Allwright, R.L. and others. "Turns, Topics, and Tasks: An Investigation for a Case-study Approach to Classroom Language Learning." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

American Institutes for Research (AIR). *Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program*. Palo Alto, CA: Author, 1978.

Amidon, E.J. and N. Flanders. *The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom*. Minneapolis, MN: Paul S. Amidon Assoc, 1963.

Andersson, T. and M. Boyer, eds. *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1970.

d'Anglejan, A. and G.R. Tucker. "The Acquisition of Complex English Structures by Adult Learners." *Language Learning* 25:2, 281-296, 1975.

Arendt, J.D. "Predicting Success in Foreign Language Study: A Study Made in Selected Minneapolis Schools from 1963 to 1964." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Minnesota, 1967.

Aspira of New York. *Aspira National Think Tank Report: Bilingual Education*. NY: Author, 1973.

Baca, P. "Learning Styles Differ--So Should Bilingual Teaching Strategies." *Un Nuevo Día* 2:2, 4-5, 1976.

Bach, E. and R.T. Harms. *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New

York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Bailey, N. and others. "Is There a 'Natural Sequence' in Adult Second Language Learning?" *Language Learning* 24:2, 235-243, 1974.

_____ and others. "Developing Question Formation Abilities in Adult Language Learners." Paper presented at the TESOL Conference, New York, 1976.

Bain, B.C. "On Bilingual Education." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'etudes Canadiennes* 10:3, 57-62, 1975.

_____. "Toward an Integration of Piaget and Vygotsky: Bilingual Considerations." *Linguistics* 160:5-20, 1975.

_____. "The Consequence of Unilingualism, Disruptive Bilingualism and Creative Bilingualism for the Development of the Body Schema: A Cross-cultural Study in Canada, Italy and West Germany." Paper presented at the First International Christian University Symposium on Pedolinguistics, Mitaka, Tokyo, 1976.

Balinsky, W.L. and S.S. Peng. "An Evaluation of Bilingual Education for Spanish-speaking Children." *Urban Education* 9:3, 271-78, 1974.

Balkan, L. *Les effets du bilinguisme français-anglais sur les aptitudes intellectuelles.* Brussels: AIMAV, 1970.

Ballesteros, O.A. *The Effectiveness of Public School Education for Mexican-American Students as Perceived by Principals of Predominantly Mexican-American Enrollment.* San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1976.

Banks, J.A., ed. *Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies.* Washington, DC: NCSS, 1973.

_____. "Multiethnic Education Across Cultures." *Social Education* 42(3):176-185, 1978.

Bar-Adon, A. and W.F. Leopold, eds. *Child Language: A Book of Readings.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Baratz, J.C. "A Bi-dialectal Task for Determining Language Proficiency in Economically Disadvantaged Negro Children." *Child Development* 40:889-901, 1969.

Barber, C.G. "Trilingualism in an Arizona Yaqui Village." In *Bilingualism in the Southwest*, edited by R.P. Turner. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

Barik, H.C. and M. Swain. "English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study." *Modern Language Journal* 58:392-402, 1974.

_____ and M. Swain. "Three-year Evaluation of a Large Scale Early Grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study." *Language Learning* 25:1, 1-30, 1975.

_____ and M. Swain. "Primary-grade French Immersion in a Unilingual English-Canadian Setting: The Toronto Study through Grade 2." *Canadian Journal of Education* 1:39-58, 1976.

Bartlett, E.J. *Adventures in Living: A Preschool Program.* New York: Western Publishing Co., 1971.

Bartley, D.E. *Soviet Approaches to Bilingual Education.* Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development, 1971.

Basso, K.H. and N. Anderson. "A Western Apache Writing System: The Symbols of Silas John." In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

Bastide, R. *Applied Anthropology*. New York: Harper Tochbooks, 1971.

Bauman, R. and J. Sherzer, eds. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Bell, D.V.J. "Political Linguistics and the Study of Power." Paper presented to the 17th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Toronto, 1976.

Ben-Zeev, S. "The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Development and Cognitive Strategy." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Chicago, 1972.

_____. "Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Development and Cognitive Strategy." Paper presented at the Child Language Research Forum, Stanford University, 1976.

_____. "Mechanisms by which Childhood Bilingualism Affects Understanding of Language and Cognitive Structures." Paper presented at SUNY conference on bilingualism, Plattsburgh, NY, 1976.

Berelson, B. and G.A. Steiner. *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1963.

Bernal, E.M., Jr. "Assessing Assessment Instruments: A Chicano Perspective." Paper prepared for the regional training programs to serve the bilingual/bicultural exceptional child. Sacramento, CA: Mortel Educational Associates, 1972.

Bertkau, J. "Comprehension and Production of English Relative Clauses in Adult Second Language and Child First Language Acquisition." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Michigan, 1974.

Blanco, G.M. "The Role of Foreign Language Educators in Bilingual Education." In *Texas Conference on Coordinating Foreign Languages: A Report of the Proceedings*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, 1976.

_____. "The Education Perspective." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Bloch, M., ed. *Political Language and Oratory in Traditional Society*. London and New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Bloom, L. *Language Development: Form and Function*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1970.

_____. *One Word at a Time: The Use of Single Word Utterances before Syntax*. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Bloomfield, L. "Literate and Illiterate Speech." *American Speech* 2:423-439, 1972.

Board of Education of the City of Chicago. *A Comprehensive Design for Bilingual-Bicultural Education*. Chicago: Author, 1974.

Bogardus, E.S. *Essentials of Americanization*. Los Angeles:

University of Southern California Press, 1920.

Bolger, P.A. "The Effect of Spanish Language Fluency upon Student Achievement in a Bilingual Science Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], St. John's University, 1967.

Bolinger, D. Aspects of Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1975.

Borker, R.A. "Performing with Words." Reviews in Anthropology 3:2, 152-160, 1976.

Bostock, W.W. "The Linguistic and Cultural Prerequisites for Participation in Australian Society." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Tasmania (Hobart), 1974.

Bouthillier, G. and J. Meynaud. "Introduction." In Le Choc des langues au Québec 1760-1970, edited by G. Bouthillier and J. Meynaud. Montreal: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 1972.

Bowen, J.D. "Material Designs for Intermediate and Advanced Second-Language Classes." TESL Workpapers, UCLA 6:1-10, 1972.

_____ and J. Ornstein, eds. Studies in Southwest Spanish (Series in Sociolinguistics). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1976.

Bowerman, M. Early Syntactic Development: A Cross-linguistic Study with Special Reference to Finnish (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, II). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Boyd, P.A. "Second Language Learning: The Grammatical Development of Anglo Children Learning through Spanish." MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1974.

_____. "The Development of Grammar Categories in Spanish by Anglo Children Learning a Second Language." TESOL Quarterly 9:125-135, 1975.

Braun, S.W. "Bilingual Education, Old and New Style in a New York School District." Bilingual Review 2:248-258, 1975.

Broadbent, R.R. "Some Consequences in Following an Elementary School Curriculum in a Second Language." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1973.

Brooks, N. Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1960.

_____. "Parameters of Culture." Based on a talk entitled "Culture vs. Civilization," delivered at the Connecticut Foreign Language Teachers Convention, New Britain, CT, 1972.

Brown, R. A First Language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.

_____. "Development of the First Language in the Human Species." American Psychologist 28:2, 97-106, 1973.

Bruck, M. and others. "Bilingual Schooling through the Elementary Grades: The St. Lambert Project at Grade Seven." Language Learning 24:183-204, 1974.

_____ and others. "Assessing Functional Bilingualism with a Bilingual Program: The St. Lambert Project at Grade Eight." Montreal: Department of Psychology, McGill University, 1975.

_____ and others. "Alternative Forms of Immersion for Second Language Teaching." Working Papers on Bilingualism 10:22-75, 1976.

Brunak, J. and others. "Conversations with Rafaela." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

Burling, R. "Language Development of a Garo and English Speaking Child." Word 15:45-68, 1959.

Burstall, C. and others. Primary French in the Balance. Windsor, England: NFER Publishing Co., Ltd., 1974.

Burt, M. and other eds. Viewpoints on English as a Second Language. New York: Regents, 1977.

Buteau, M.F. "Students' Errors in the Learning of French as a Second Language." IRAL 7:2, 133-146, 1970.

Butterworth, G. "A Spanish-speaking Adolescent's Acquisition of English Syntax." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1972.

Bye, T.T. Tests that Measure Language Ability: A Descriptive Compilation. Berkeley, CA: BABEL/LAU Center, 1977.

Byron, J.L. Selection among Alternates in Language Standardization: The Case of Albanian. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Campbell, D.T. "Reforms as Experiments." American Psychologist 24:409-429, 1969.

Campbell, R.N. "English Curricula for Non-English Speakers." Georgetown University Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics 23:301-312, 1970.

_____ and others. "Teachers' Views of Immersion-type Bilingual Programs: A Quebec Example." Foreign Language Annals 7: 106-110, 1973.

Cancino, H. and others. "The Acquisition of the English Auxiliary by Native Spanish Speakers." TESOL Quarterly 9:421-430, 1975.

Caramazza, A. and others. "The Acquisition of a New Phonological Contrast: The Case of Stop Consonants in French-English Bilinguals." Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 54:421-428, 1973.

Cárdenas, B. and J.A. Cárdenas. The Theory of Incompatibilities: A Conceptual Framework for Responding to the Educational Needs of Mexican American Children. San Antonio, TX: Intercultural Development Research Association, n.d.

Cárdenas, J.A. "Viewpoint: Budgeting for Bilingual Education." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Carringer, D.C. "Creative Thinking Abilities of Mexican Youth: The Relationship of Bilingualism." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 5:492-504, 1974.

Carroll, J.B. Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Carter, T.P. Mexican Americans in School: History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Casagrande, J.B. "Commanche Linguistic Acculturation." International Journal of Anthropological Linguistics 20:140-151, 1954; 22:8-25, 1955.

Castañeda, A. and others. A New Philosophy of Education. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1975.

Casteel, J.D. and M. Williford. *Planning Cross-Cultural Lessons.* Albuquerque, NM: Latin American Studies Association, 1976.

Cathcart, R. "Report on a Group of Anglo Children after One Year of Immersion in Spanish." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1972.

Cazden, C. and other eds. *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

_____ and E.L. Leggett. "Culturally Responsive Education: A Response to *Lau* Guidelines II." Paper prepared for the Conference on Research and Policy Implications of the Task Force Report of the U.S. Office of Civil Rights. Austin, TX: Southwest Development Laboratory, 1976.

Celce-Murcia, M. "The Simultaneous Acquisition of English and French in a Two-year-old Child." Paper presented at the TESOL conference, Los Angeles, 1975.

Center for Applied Linguistics. *Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual/Bicultural Education*. Arlington, VA: Author, 1974.

Center for Law and Education. *Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Handbook for Attorneys and Community Workers*. Cambridge, MA: Author, 1975.

Cervantes, R.A. "Teacher Behavior- and Cultural Responsiveness: Theoretical and Practical Considerations." In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Research and Policy Implications, Lau Task Force Report*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1976.

Chamot, A.U. "Phonological Problems in Learning English as a Third Language." *IRAL* 11:3, 243-250, 1973.

Chapa, R.R. "English Reading in the Mexican-American Child in a Second Grade Bilingual Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Michigan State University, 1975.

Chastain, K. *The Development of Modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971.

Chomsky, N. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.

_____. "A Review of B.F. Skinner, Verbal Behavior." *Language* 35:26-58, 1959.

_____. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965.

_____. "Linguistic Theory." In *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts*. New York: Modern Language Association Materials Center, 1966.

Christian, C.C. "Social and Psychological Implications of Bilingual Literacy." In *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*, edited by A. Simões, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

_____ and J.M. Sharp. "Bilingualism in a Pluralistic Society." In *Foreign Language Education: A Reappraisal*, edited by D.L. Lange. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1972.

Chun, J.A. and R.L. Politzer. "A Study of Language Acquisition in Two Bilingual Schools." Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education, 1975.

Churchill, S. "The Franco-Ontarian Educational Renaissance: Schooling for a Submerged Minority." Ontario: OISE, 1976.

Ciborowski, T. and S. Choy. "Nonstandard English and Free Recall: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 5:271-281, 1974.

Cicourel, A.V. *Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction*. London: Penguin, 1973.

_____. "Assessment of the Child's Performance in Testing." In *Language Use and School Performance*, edited by A.V. Cicourel and others. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

_____ and other eds. *Language Use and School Performance*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Clyne, M.G. "Switching between Language Systems." In *Vol. I, Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Linguists*, edited by A. Graur and others. Bucharest: Editions de l'académie de la republique socialiste de Rumaine, 1969.

Cohen, A.D. "A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education: The Measurement of Language Use and Attitudes toward Language in School and Community, with Special Reference to the Mexican American Community of Redwood City, California." Stanford, CA: Stanford University Committee on Linguistics, 1970.

_____. "Innovative Education for La Raza: A Sociolinguistic Assessment of a Bilingual Education Program in California." PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1973.

_____. "The Culver City Spanish Immersion Program: How Does Summer Recess Affect Spanish Speaking Ability?" *Language Learning* 24:1, 55-68, 1974.

_____. "Bilingual Schooling and Spanish Language Maintenance: An Experimental Analysis." *Bilingual Review* 2:3-12, 1975.

_____. "Forgetting a Second Language." *Language Learning* 25:1, 127-138, 1975.

_____. *A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education: Experiments in the American Southwest*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1975.

_____. "The Acquisition of Spanish Grammar through Immersion: Some Findings after Four Years." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32:562-574, 1976.

_____. "The Case for Partial or Total Immersion Education." In *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*, edited by A. Simões, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

_____ and S.M. Lebach. "A Language Experiment in California: Student, Teacher, Parent and Community Reactions after Three Years." *UCLA Working Papers in Teaching English as a Second Language* 8:33-46, 1974.

_____ and (L. Laosa). "Final Product Report on Instructional Component: Garvey School District Title VII Bilingual Education Program, 1974-75." Rosemead, CA: Garvey School District, 1975.

_____ and L. Laosa. "Approaches to Second Language Instruction: A Research Model." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, 1975.

_____ and M. Swain. "Bilingual Education: The 'Immersion' Model in the North American Context." TESOL Quarterly 10:1, 45-63, 1976.

_____ and others. "The Redwood City Bilingual Education Project, 1971-1974: Spanish and English Proficiency, Mathematics and Language Use Over Time." Working Papers on Bilingualism 8: 1-29, 1976.

Collison, G.O. "Concept Formation in a Second Language: A Study of Ghanaian School Children." Harvard Educational Review 44:3, 1974.

Colón, S.M. El bilingüismo en Puerto Rico y la actitud de un grupo de jovenes bilingües hacia el idioma vernáculo (Monograph No. 87). Río Piedras, PR: University of Puerto Rico, 1972.

Condon, E.C. "Bilingual Education." System 4:2, 1974.

Conrad, A. and J.A. Fishman. "English as a World Language: The Evidence." In The Spread of English, by J.A. Fishman and others. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Cook, V.J. "The Comparison of Language Development in Native Children and Foreign Adults." International Journal of Applied Linguistics 11:13-28, 1973.

Cooper, R.L., ed. "Language Attitudes I." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 3, 1974.

_____, ed. "Language Attitudes II." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 6, 1975.

_____. "The Spread of Amharic." In Language in Ethiopia, edited by M.L. Bender and others. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

_____. "Research Methodology in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

_____ and J.A. Fishman. "A Study of Language Attitudes: The Impact of English on Israeli High School Students." In The Spread of English, by J.A. Fishman and others. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Cordasco, F. "Spanish Speaking Children in American Schools." International Migration Review 9:379-382, 1975.

_____. Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Educational Personnel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Corder, S.P. "The Significance of Learner's Errors." IRAL 5:161-170, 1967.

Cornejo, R.J. "The Acquisition of Lexicon in the Speech of Bilingual Children." In Bilingualism in the Southwest, edited by P.R. Turner. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

_____. A Synthesis of Theories and Research on the Effects of Teaching in First and Second Languages. Austin, TX: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, 1974.

Cortés, C. and others. "Reactions to Chester A. Youngblood's

'Putting Black into Brown in Early Childhood Curricular Materials'." *Social Education* 42(5):192-194, 1978.

Covey, D. "An Analytical Study of Secondary Freshmen Bilingual Education and Its Effect on Academic Achievement and Attitude of Mexican-American Students." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Arizona State University, 1973.

Cronbach, L.J. and P.J.D. Drenth, eds. *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptations*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

Cummins, J. "The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypothesis." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 9:1-43, 1976.

_____. "Sensitivity to Non-verbal Communication as a Factor in Language Learning." *Grazer Linguistische Studien* No. 3, 1976.

_____. "Alberta Program Promotes Minority Languages." *Linguistic Reporter* 20:2, 1977.

_____. "Cognitive Factors Associated with the Attainment of Intermediate Levels of Bilingual Skills." *Modern Language Journal* 61:3-12, 1977.

_____. "Metalinguistic Development of Children in Bilingual Education Programs: Data from Irish and Canadian (Ukrainian-English) Programs." Paper presented to the Fourth LACUS Forum, Montreal, Canada, 1977.

_____. "Viewpoint: Psycholinguistic Evidence." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____ and M. Gulutsan. "Some Effects of Bilingualism on Cognitive Functioning." In *Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education*, edited by S. Carey. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, 1974.

Cziko, G. "The Effects of Different French Immersion Programs on the Language and Academic Skills of Children from Various Socioeconomic Backgrounds." MA thesis [unpublished], McGill University, 1975.

_____. "The Effects of Language Sequencing on the Development of Bilingual Reading Skills." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32:534-539, 1976.

Dale, P.S. *Language Development: Structure and Functions*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Darcy, N. "A Review of the Literature on the Effects of Bilingualism upon the Measurement of Intelligence." *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 82:21-57, 1953.

Darley, J.T. *Language Facility Test*. Alexandria, VA: The Allington Corp., 1968.

Das Gupta, J. *Language Conflict and National Development*. Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Davis, F.B., ed. *Philippine Language-Teaching Experiments*. Quezon City, Philippines: Alemar-Phoenix, 1967.

Davis, P., ed. *The Immigrant and the State*. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1920.

De Avila, E.A. and B. Hanassy. *Intelligency of Mexican American Children: A Field Study Comparing Neo-Piagetian and Tradi-*

tional Capacity and Achievement Measures. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1974.

_____ and others. *Mexican-American School Children: A Neo-Piagetian Approach*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1976.

de la Garza, R. and C.L. Cotrell (with G. Korbel). "Internal Colonialism and Chicanos: A Reconceptualization." Paper presented to the 17th Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Toronto, 1976.

de Ronceray, H. and S. Petit-Frère. "Project experimental sur le bilinguisme créole-français au niveau de l'enseignement primaire en Haiti." *Les Cahiers du CHISS* (Revue Haitien de Sciences Sociales) 12:1-35, 1975.

de Vos, G. and L. Romanucci-Ross, eds. *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield, 1975.

Della-Dora, D. and J.E. House, eds. *Education for an Open Society*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974.

deStefano, J.S. *Language, Society and Education: A Profile of Black English*. Worthington, OH: C.A. Jones, 1973.

deVilliers, J. and P. deVilliers. "A Cross-sectional Study of the Acquisition of Grammatical Morphemes in Child Speech." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 2:267-278, 1973.

Dewey, J. "Aims in Education." In *Readings in the Philosophy of Education*, edited by J.M. Rich. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966.

Dickerson, L.J. "The Learner's Interlanguage as a System of Variable Rules." *TESOL Quarterly* 9:4, 401-408, 1975.

Dickson, D.L. "Methods and Problems of Language Dominance Testing." *Materiales en marcha* January 1975, pp. 10-16.

Diebold, R. "Bilingualism and Biculturalism in a Hauve Community." PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1961.

_____. "A Laboratory for Language Contact." *Anthropological Linguistics* 4:41-51, 1962.

Dil, A.S., ed. *The Ecology of Language--Essays by Einar Haugen*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1972.

Diller, K.C. *Generative Grammar, Structural Linguistics, and Language Teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1971.

Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education (DACBE). *Directories of Title VII ESEA Bilingual Education Programs: 1969-1976*. Austin, TX: Author, 1969-1976.

_____. *Evaluation Instruments for Bilingual Education*. Austin, TX: Author, 1975.

_____. *Teacher Education Programs for Bilingual Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Austin, TX: Author, 1975, 1976.

Dozier, E.P. "Two Examples of Linguistic Acculturation: The Yaqui of Sonora and Arizona and the Tewa of New Mexico." *Language* 32:1, 146-151, 1956.

Drake, G.F. "Integrity, Promise and Language Planning." *Language Learning* 25:267-279, 1975.

Dulay, H. and M. Burt. "A New Perspective on the Creative Construction Processes in Child Second Language Acquisition." *Language Learning* 24:253-278, 1974.

_____ and M. Burt. "Errors and Strategies in Child Second Language Acquisition." *TESOL Quarterly* 8(2):129-136, 1974.

_____ and M. Burt. "Creative Construction in Second Language Learning and Teaching." In *Papers in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by H.D. Brown. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1976.

_____ and M. Burt. "Remarks on Creativity in Language Acquisition." In *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language*, edited by M. Burt and others. New York: Regents, 1977.

_____ and others. *Why Bilingual Education? A Summary of Research Findings*. Berkeley, CA: BABEL/LAU Center, 1976.

Dunkin, M.J. and B.J. Biddle. *The Study of Teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Duskova, L. "On Sources of Errors in Foreign Language Learning." *IRAL* 7:1, 11-33, 1969.

Edelman, M. *Politics as a Symbolic Action: Mass Arousal and Quiescence*. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Education Service Center, Region II. *Adult Education: Bilingual Handbook*. Corpus Christi, TX: Author, 1976.

Educational Management Services, Inc. *A Comparative Analysis of Four Bilingual-Bicultural Demonstration Centers*. Final report to the city of Chicago Board of Education. Chicago: Author, 1974-75.

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (EPIE). *Selector's Guide for Educational Materials: Vol. 1, Spanish Language Arts* (EPIE Report No. 73). New York: Author, 1976.

_____. *Selector's Guide for Bilingual Education Materials: Vol. 2, Spanish "Branch" Programs* (EPIE Report No. 74). New York: Author, 1976.

Edwards, H.P. and F. Smyth. "Alternatives to Early Immersion Programs for the Acquisition of French as a Second Language." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32:524-529, 1976.

Edwards, J.R. "Current Issues in Bilingual Education." *Ethnicity* 3:70-81, 1976.

Elegöet, F. "Bilinguisme ou domination linguistique?" *Les Temps Modernes* Aug.-Sept., 1973, nos. 324, 325, 326.

Eldridge, M.D. "Activities of the National Center for Education Statistics Related to Bilingual Education." *NABE Journal* 2(1):35-38, 1978.

Elías-Olivarés, L. "Ways of Speaking in a Chicano Community: A Sociolinguistic Approach." PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

_____. *Language Use in a Chicano Community* (Working Papers in Sociolinguistics No. 30). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1976.

Engle, P.L. *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education: Language Medium in Early School Years for Minority Language Groups* (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education

Series No. 3). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Epstein, N. *Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools: Policy Alternatives for Bilingual-Bicultural Education*. Washington, DC: George Washington University Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977.

Erickson, F. "The Politics of Speaking: An Approach to Evaluating Bilingual-Bicultural Schools." *Division Generator (AREA)* No. 3, 9-13, 1974.

_____. "Gatekeeping and the Melting Pot: Interaction in Counseling Encounters." *Harvard Educational Review* 45:44-70, 1975.

_____ and J. Shultz. "When Is a Context? Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence." *ICHD Newsletter* 1:2, 5-10, 1977.

Ervin-Tripp, S. "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic, and Listener." *American Anthropologist* 66:6, 86-102, 1964.

_____. "Structures and Process in Language Acquisition." In *Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice*, edited by A. Dil. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1973.

Fallis, G.V. and R. García-Moya, eds. *Teaching Spanish to the Spanish-Speaking: Theory and Practice* (Papers in Southwestern English Series, 2). San Antonio, TX: Trinity University, 1976.

Fantini, A.E. "Language Acquisition of a Bilingual Child: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1974.

Farb, P. *Word Play*. New York: Bantam Books, 1977.

Fasold, R.W. "Languages of Education: How to Decide." Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1975.

_____. "Sociolinguistics: Contributions to Bilingual Education." Paper prepared for Linguistic Society of America Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1975.

_____ and W. Wolfram. *The Study of Social Dialects in American English*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Fathman, A. "Language Background, Age and the Order of Acquisition of English Structures." Paper presented at the TESOL conference, Los Angeles, 1975.

_____. "The Relationship between Age and Second Language Productive Ability." *Language Learning* 25:2, 245-254, 1975.

_____. "Oral Production Errors in the Morphology and Syntax of Children Learning English as a Second Language." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Stanford University, 1976.

Feldman, C. and M. Shen. "Some Language-related Cognitive Advantages of Bilingual Five-Year-Olds." *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 118:234-235, 1971.

Fellman, J. *The Revival of a Classical Tongue*. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Ferguson, C.A. "Applied Linguistics." In *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts*, edited by R.G. Mean, Jr. Menasha, WI:

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966.

_____. "Language Development." In *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, edited by J.A. Fishman and others. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1968.

_____. "Language Problems of Variation and Repertoire." In *Language as a Human Problem*, edited by E. Haugen and M. Bloomfield. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1974.

_____. "Baby Talk as a Simplified Register." In *Talking to Children*, edited by C.E. Snow and C.A. Ferguson. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

_____. "Viewpoint: Linguistic Theory." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "Literacy in Multilingual Nations." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

_____ and J.J. Gumperz. "Linguistic Diversity in South Asia." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 26:3, Part II, 1960.

_____ and D.I. Slobin, eds. *Studies of Child Language Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

_____ and O.K. Garnica. "Theories of Phonological Development." In *Foundations of Language Development I*, edited by E.H. Lenneberg and E. Lenneberg. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

_____ and other eds. *Nasálfest*. Stanford University: Department of Linguistics, 1975.

_____ and others. "Bilingual Education: An International Perspective." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Fillmore, L.W. "Thoughts on Non-English Speaking Children and Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Finocchiaro, M. *Teaching Children Foreign Languages*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Fishman, J.A. "Bilingualism, Intelligence and Language Learning." *Modern Language Journal* 49:227-237, 1965.

_____. "The Politics of Bilingual Education." *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* 23:47-58, 1970.

_____. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry." In [revisited] his *Language in Sociocultural Change*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1972.

_____. *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972.

_____. *The Sociology of Yiddish in America: Past, Present and Future* (Sixth Series, No. 3). Jerusalem: Jerusalem Institute of Contemporary Jewry, 1973 [in Hebrew].

_____. "The Phenomenological and Linguistic Pilgrimage of Yiddish (Some Examples of Functional and Structural Pidginization and Depidginization)." Kansas Journal of Sociology 9:127-136, 1973.

_____. "The Historical Dimension in the Sociology of Language." In Report of the Twenty-third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

_____, ed. Advances in Language Planning. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

_____. "The Sociology of Bilingual Education." Etude Linguistique Appliquée 15:112-124, 1974.

_____. "Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective." Keynote address delivered at the Fifth Annual International Bilingual/Bicultural Education Conference, San Antonio, TX, 1976.

_____. Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective. Rowley ,MA: Newbury House, 1976.

_____. "Ethnicity and Language." In Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations, edited by H. Giles. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

_____. "Bilingual Education for the Children of Immigrant Workers in Northern Europe: The Adaptation of General Models to a New Specific Challenge." Un Nuevo Día 2:3, 1976.

_____, ed. Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

_____. "The Social Science Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "The Spread of English as a New Perspective for the Study of 'Language Maintenance and Language Shift'." In The Spread of English, by J.A. Fishman and others. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____. "Social Theory and Educational Philosophy in Bilingual Education." In Language Development in a Bilingual Setting, edited by G. Briere. Pomona, CA: Materials Development Center, 1977.

_____ and V.C. Nahirny. "The Ethnic-group School and Mother Tongue Maintenance in the United States." Sociology of Education 9:32-70, 1964.

_____ and V.C. Nahirny. "The Ethnic-group School and Mother Tongue Maintenance." In Language Loyalty in the United States, edited by J.A. Fishman and others. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

_____ and J. Lovas. "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective." TESOL Quarterly 4:215-222, 1970.

_____ and E. Lueders-Salmon. "What Has the Sociology of Language to Say to the Teacher on Teaching the Standard Variety to Speakers of Dialectal or Sociolectal Varieties?" In Functions of Language in the Classroom, edited by C. Cazden and others. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

_____ and J. Fellman. "How Do Terminology Committees of the Hebrew Language Academy Actually Work?" In Language Planning Processes, by J. Rubin and others. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

_____ and others. Bilingualism in the Barrio (Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monograph No. 7). The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

_____ and others. "English Around the World." In The Spread of English, by J.A. Fishman and others. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Flavell, J.H. "Developmental Studies in Mediated Memory." In Advances in Child Development and Behavior, Vol. 5, edited by L. Lipsitt and H. Reese. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Flores, H. "The Nature and Effectiveness of Bilingual Education Programs for the Spanish-Speaking Child in the United States." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Ohio State University, 1969.

Flores, M. "Early Stages in the Acquisition of Spanish Syntax Structures by a Group of English-speaking Children." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1973.

_____. "Opinions of Chicano Community Parents on Curriculum and Language Use in Bilingual Preschool Education." Aztlán 4:2, 315-334, 1973.

Florio, S. and M. Walsh. "The Teacher as Colleague in Classroom Research." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1976.

Frasure-Smith, N. and others. "Choosing the Language of Instruction for One's Children: A Quebec Study." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 6:131-155, 1975.

Fromkin, V. and R. Rodman. An Introduction to Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

_____ and others. "The Linguistic Development of Genie." Language 50:528-554, 1974.

Fuchs, E. and R.J. Havighurst. To Live on This Earth: American Indian Education. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1972.

Fuchs, L.H., ed. American Ethnic Politics. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Gaarder, A.B. "Linkages between Foreign Language Teaching and Bilingual Education." Bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages 6:3, 8-11, 1975.

Gaarder, B. "The First Seventy-six Bilingual Education Projects." Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 23:163-178, 1970.

_____. Bilingual Schooling and the Survival of Spanish in the United States (Studies in Bilingual Education). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Gage, W. and S. Ohannessian. "ESOL Enrollments throughout the World." The Linguistic Reporter 16:9, 13-16, 1974.

Gallimore, R. and others. Culture, Behavior and Education: A Study of Hawaiian-Americans. London and Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1974.

García, G.N. "Test Encounters of the Third Kind." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

García, J.D. "Viewpoint: Analyzing Bilingual Education Costs." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Gardner, R.C. and P.C. Smythe. "The Integrative Motive in Second-language Acquisition." In Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education, edited by S.T. Carey. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta, 1974.

Garfinkel, H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Garvin, P.L. "The Standard Language Problem--Concepts and Methods." Anthropological Linguistics 1:2, 28-31, 1959.

Gasser, M. "A Stage in the Acquisition of Amharic by an Adult." UCLA Psycholinguistics TESL Project, 1975.

Gatbonton-Segalowitz, E. "Systematic Variation in Second Language Speech: A Sociolinguistic Study." PhD dissertation [unpublished], McGill University, 1975.

Geerts, G. and others. "Successes and Failures in Dutch Spelling Reform." In Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

Geffert, H.N. and others. The Current Status of U.S. Bilingual Education Legislation (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series No. 4). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Genesee, F. "An Experimental French Immersion Program at the Second School Level--1969-1974." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1974.

_____. "Evaluation of English Writing Skills: Students after Six Years of French." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1974.

_____. "The Suitability of Immersion Programs for All Children." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:494-515, 1976.

_____ and S. Chaplin. "Evaluation of the 1974-75 Grade 5 French Immersion Class." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1975.

_____ and others. "Evaluation of the 1973-74 Pilot Grade 4 French Immersion Class." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1974.

_____ and others. "Communication Skills of Bilingual Children." Child Development 46:1010-1014, 1975.

_____ and others. "An Experiment in Trilingual Education." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:115-128, 1976.

Genovese, E.D. Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made. New York: Pantheon, 1974.

Gezi, K. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Review of Relevant Research." California Journal of Educational Research 25: 223-239, 1975.

Gibb, G. "Mathematics and the Bilingual Student." Newsletter of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics December 1974, pp. 1 and 4.

Gingras, R., ed. Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Glazer, N. "Ethnicity and the Schools." Commentary September

1974, pp. 55-59.

_____ and D.P. Moynihan, eds. Ethnicity: Theory and Experience. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Glucksberg, S. and others. "Referential Communication in Nursery School Children: Method and Some Preliminary Findings." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology 3:333-342, 1966.

Gonzáles-Moreyra, R. and J. Aliaga. "La formación de conceptos en niños bilingües." In El Reto del Multilingüismo en el Perú, edited by A. Escobar. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1972.

González, A. "The 1973 Constitution and the Bilingual Education Policy of the Department of Education and Culture." Philippine Studies 22:325-337, 1974.

Gonzáles-Atiles, E. and others. "Toward a Language Policy for Puerto Ricans in the United States." New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, 1976.

González, G. "Analysis of Chicano Spanish and the 'Problem of Usage': A Critique of Chicano Spanish Dialects and Education." Aztlán 3:223-231, 1973.

_____. "Viewpoint: Teaching Bilingual Children." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

González, J. "Coming of Age in Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Historical Perspective." In Inequality in Education: Bilingual/Bicultural Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Center for Law and Education, 1975.

_____. "The Status of Bilingual Education Today: Un Vistazo y un Repaso." NABE Journal 2(1):13-20, 1978.

González, J.M., ed. Reviewing Instructional Materials for Cultural Relevancy. San Antonio, TX: Curriculum Adaptation Network for Bilingual/Bicultural Education, n.d.

Goodenough, W. "Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics." In Language in Culture and Society, edited by D. Hymes. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Goodman, F.M. and C. Stern. Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA Title VII, IP70-71. Compton, CA: Compton City Schools, 1971.

Gordon, M.M. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Graber, D.A. Verbal Behavior and Politics. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1976.

Gradisnik, A. "Los Olvidados: Meeting Bilingual Education Student Needs at a Secondary Level." In Careers, Communication and Culture in Foreign Language Teaching, edited by F.M. Grittner. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1975.

Gray, T.C. "Cultural Differences in Achievement and Motivation--a Crucial Factor?" Un Nuevo Día 2:2, 2-3, 1976.

_____. "Challenge to USOE Final Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs." Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978 [news release].

Greenberg, J.H., ed. *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1966.

Greene, J.F. and P.A. Zirkel. "The Validation of a Scale Designed to Measure Cultural Attitudes." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974.

Gudschinsky, S. "Literacy in the Mother Tongue and Second Language Learning." Paper presented at the Conference on Child Language, Chicago, 1971.

Gumperz, J.J. "The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code Switching." In *Papers on Language and Context*, edited by J. Cooke and J.J. Gumperz. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

_____ and E. Hernández-Chávez. "Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication." In *Language Use and Social Change*, edited by W.H. Whitely. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

_____ and E. Hernández-Chávez. "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction." In *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, edited by C. Cazden and others. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

_____ and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Guskin, J.T. "Understanding Bilingual Teachers: A Sociolinguistic Analysis." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Worcester, MA, March 1975.

_____. "What the Child Brings and What the School Expects." In *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*, edited by A. Simões, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Habermas, J. "Toward a Theory of Communicative Competence." In *Recent Sociology No. 2*, edited by P. Dreitzel. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1972.

Hakuta, K. "A Preliminary Report on the Development of Grammatical Morphemes in a Japanese Girl Learning English as a Second Language." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 3:18-43, 1974.

_____. "Learning to Speak a Second Language: What Exactly Does the Child Learn?" Paper presented at the 26th Annual Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1975.

Hall, E.T. *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press, 1977.

Hall, V.C. and R.R. Turner. "The Validity of the 'Different Language Explanation' for Poor Scholastic Performance by Black Students." *Review of Educational Research* 44:69-81, 1973.

_____ and R.O. Freedle. "A Developmental Investigation of Standard and Nonstandard English among Black and White Children." *Human Development* 16:440-464, 1973.

Hall, W. "Viewpoint: Cross-Cultural Research." In *Bilingual*

Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

______ and others. "Variations in Young Children's Use of Language: Some Effects of Setting and Dialect." In *Discourse Production*, edited by R.O. Freedle. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Assoc, 1975.

Halliday, M.A.K. "The Users and Uses of Language." In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, edited by J.A. Fishman, The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Hamayan, E. "French Oral Production and Awareness of Errors by English Children Educated Bilingually." Paper presented at TESOL convention, New York, 1976.

Hanania, E. "Acquisition of English Structure: A Case Study of an Adult Native Speaker of Arabic in an English-speaking Environment." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Indiana University, 1974.

Hansford, B.W. "Viewpoint: Meeting the Needs." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Harris, D.P. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Harrison, W. and others. *English-Language Policy Survey of Jordan: A Case Study in Language Planning*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Hartford, B. "The English of Mexican-American Adolescents in Gary, Indiana: A Sociolinguistic Description." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1975.

Hasselmo, N. "American-Swedish: A Study in Bilingualism." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Harvard University, 1961.

Hatch, E. "Studies in Language Mixing and Switching." Paper presented at the 9th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago, 1973.

______. "Research on Reading a Second Language." *Journal of Reading Behavior* 6:1, 53-61, 1974.

______. "Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition." Paper presented at NAFSA conference, 1976.

______. "Viewpoint: Second Language Learning." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

______ and J. Wagner-Gough. "Explaining Sequence and Variation in Second Language Acquisition." In *Papers in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by H.D. Brown. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1975.

Haugen, E. *Language Conflict and Language Planning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Hayes, A.S. and others. "Foreign Language Teaching." *Foreign Language Annals* 1:22-44, 1967.

Heath, S.B. *Telling Tongues: Language Policy in Mexico, Colony to Nation*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

______. "Viewpoint: Social History." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1*. Arlington, VA: Center for

Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "Bilingual Education and a National Language Policy." Paper presented at the 1978 Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Heckler, E.E. "The Acquisition of English Verb Morphology by Non-native Speakers." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Michigan State University, 1975.

Hernández, F. "Cultural Pluralism, School Governance and the Chicano Community." In Perspectives on Chicano Education, edited by T. and S. González. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Hernández-Chávez, E. and others. El Lenguaje de los Chicanos: Regional and Social Characteristics of Language Used by Mexican Americans. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Hocker, N. "Two-Stimulus Transposition as Demonstrated by Spanish/English Speaking Children from Bilingual (Spanish/English) and Monolingual (English) Instruction Classrooms." PhD dissertation [unpublished], New Mexico State University, 1973.

Holm, A. and W. Holm. "English Loan Words in the Speech of Young Navajo Children." In Bilingualism in the Southwest, edited by P.R. Turner. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

Horner, V.M. "Bilingual Literacy." In A Report from the National Academy of Education, edited by J.B. Carroll and J.S. Chall. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Horowitz, D.L. "Three Dimensions of Ethnic Politics." World Politics 23:2, 232-244, 1971.

_____. "Ethnic Identity." In Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, edited by N. Glazer and D. Moynihan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

_____. The Courts and Social Policy. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute, 1977.

Huang, J. "A Chinese Child's Acquisition of English." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1971.

Hunt, K.W. Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels (Research Report No. 3). Champaign, IL: NCTE, 1965.

Hurd, M. "The Bilingual Spanish Child in Public Funded Pre-Schools." New York: Yeshiva University, 1975.

Husen, T. "Policy Implications of Cross-National Educational Surveys." New York University Education Quarterly Spring 1976.

Hymes, D. Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

_____. "Speech and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality among Speakers." In Language as a Human Problem, edited by E. Haugen and M. Bloomfield. New York: W.W. Norton and Co, 1974.

Ianco-Worrall, A. "Bilingualism and Cognitive Development." Child Development 43:1390-1400, 1972.

Inclán, R.G. "An Updated Report of Bilingual Schooling in Dade County, Including Results of a Recent Evaluation." Paper presented at the Conference on Child Language, Chicago, 1971.

Irish Committee on Language Attitudes. *Committee on Language Attitudes Research Report*. Dublin: Irish Government Printing Office, 1975.

Isaacs, H.R. *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change*. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Isman, J. "The Acquisition of English Syntax by Indonesian Children." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Indiana, 1973.

Itoh, H. "A Child's Acquisition of Two Languages--Japanese and English." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1973.

Jakobson, R. *Child Language, Aphasia and Phonological Universals*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Jaramillo, M-L. "The Future of Bilingual-Bicultural Education." In *Ghosts in the Barrio: Issues in Bilingual-Bicultural Education*, edited by R. Poblano. San Rafael, CA: Leswing Press, 1973.

Jashni, V.M. "The Effects of the Spanish Immersion Program on the Kindergarten and Primary Students in Affective and Cognitive Domains." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Brigham Young University, 1976.

Jenks, J. and W.J. Lauck. *The Immigrant Problem: A Study of American Immigration, Conditions and Needs*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1913.

Jensen, J.V. "Effects of Childhood Bilingualism." *Elementary English* 39:132-143, 1962.

Jespersen, O. *Language, Its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1922.

Johannesson, I. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education of Immigrant Children in Sweden." *International Review of Education* 21:3, 347-355, 1975.

John, V.P. and E. Sauberman. "Educational Perspectives on Bilingual Education." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Johnson, E. *Report on Bilingual Pilot Schools in New York City: A Study of a Court-Ordered Program for Pupils with English Language Difficulty*. New York: Community Service Society, 1975.

Johnson, G.W. *Our English Heritage*. Philadelphia, PA: J.P. Lippincott, 1949.

Johnson, N.A. "A Psycholinguistic Study of Bilingual Language Acquisition." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1973.

Johnston, V. "Observations on Learning French by Immersion." UCLA Psycholinguistics TESL Project, 1972.

Jones, R.F. *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1953.

Jones, R.L. and B. Spolsky, eds. *Testing Language Proficiency*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Jones, W.R. *Bilingualism in Welsh Education*. Cardiff, Wales:

University of Wales Press, 1966.

Kahane, H. and R. Kahane. "The Decline and Hidden Survival of Prestige Languages." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

Kaplan, R.B. *The Anatomy of Rhetoric*. Philadelphia, PA: The Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Keats, D.M. and others. "Conceptual Acquisition in Malaysian Bilingual Children." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 7:87-99, 1976.

Keenan, E.O. "Conversational Competence in Children." *Journal of Child Language* 1:163-193, 1974.

Kempf, M.K. "A Study of English Proficiency Levels of the Composition Errors of Incoming Foreign Students at the University of Cincinnati during 1969-1974." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Ohio State University, 1975.

Kenyeres, A. and E. Kenyeres. "Comment un petite Hongroise de sept ans apprend le français." *Archives de Psychologie* 26: 104, 322-366, 1938.

Kessler, C. *Acquisition of Syntax in Bilingual Children*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1971.

Khubchandani, L.M. "Language Ideology and Language Development: An Appraisal of Indian Education Policy." Honolulu: East-West Center, 1975.

Kjolseth, R. "Bilingual Education Programs in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism?" In *Bilingualism in the Southwest*, edited by P.R. Turner. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1973.

Kloss, H. "German-American Language Maintenance Efforts." In *Language Loyalty in the United States*, by J.A. Fishman and others. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

_____. *Laws and Legal Documents Relating to Problems of Bilingual Education in the United States*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971.

_____. "Fundamentals of Bilingual Schooling." Paper presented at the 34th Annual meeting of the Society for Applied Linguistics, Amsterdam, 1975.

_____. *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Kobrick, J. "The Compelling Case for Bilingual Education." *Saturday Review* April 29, 1972, pp. 54-58.

Kolers, P.A. "Reading and Talking Bilingually." *American Journal of Psychology* 79:357-376, 1966.

Krashen, S. "Monitor Theory: A Model of Adult Second Language Performance." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

_____. "Formal and Informal Linguistic Environments in Language Acquisition and Language Learning." *TESOL Quarterly* 10:2, 157-168, 1976.

_____. "The Monitor Model for Second-Language Acquisition." In *Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*, edited by R. Gingras. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Krauss, M.E. "Alaska Native Language Legislation." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40:2, 150-152, 1974.

Kruis, S.A. "Language Planning and Navajo Education." MA thesis [unpublished], University of New Mexico, 1975.

Kurath, H. *Studies in Areal Linguistics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1972.

LaBelle, T.J. "Liberation, Development, and Rural Nonformal Education." *Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 6:4, 20-26, 1975.

Labov, W. "The Place of Linguistic Research in American Society." In *Linguistics in the 1970's*, by J.H. Greenberg. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

_____. "The Logic of Non-standard English." In *Language and Poverty*, edited by F. Williams. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

_____. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lado, R. *Language Testing*. London: Longmans, 1961.

LaFontaine, H. "Para-professionals: Their Role in ESOL and Bilingual Education." *TESOL Quarterly* 5:309-314, 1971.

_____. "Bilingual Education for Puerto Ricans: Sí o No?" Paper presented to the National Conference on the Educational Needs of the Puerto Rican in the United States, Cleveland, OH, April 1975.

LaMarche, M.M. "The Topic Comment Pattern in the Development of English among Some Chinese Children Living in the U.S." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Georgetown University, 1972.

Lambert, W.E. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues* 23:2, 91-109, 1967.

_____. "Psychological Studies of the Interdependence of the Bilingual's Two Languages." In *Substance and Structure of Language*, edited by J. Puhvel. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

_____. "Culture and Language as Factors in Learning and Education." In *Education of Immigrant Students*, edited by A. Wolfgang. Toronto: OISE, 1975.

_____. "The Effects of Bilingualism on the Individual: Cognitive and Sociocultural Consequences." Paper presented at a Seminar on Bilingualism, SUNY, Plattsburg, NY, March 1976.

_____ and G.R. Tucker. *The Bilingual Education of Children*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972.

_____ and others. "A Study of the Roles of Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning." Montreal: McGill University, 1962.

_____ and others. "Cognitive and Attitudinal Consequences of Bilingual Schooling: The St. Lambert Project through Grade Five." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 65:141-159, 1973.

_____ and others. "Language Attitudes in a French American Community." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*

4:127-152, 1975.

Lance, D.M. *A Brief Study of Spanish-English Bilingualism: Final Report*. College Station, TX: Texas A & M University Press, 1969.

Lancey, D.F. *The Beliefs and Behaviors of Pupils in an Experimental School*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Learning Research and Development Center, 1976.

Lane, H. *The Wild Boy of Aveyron*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Laosa, L. "Bilingualism in Three United States Hispanic Groups: Contextual Use of Language by Children and Adults in Their Families." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67:617-627, 1975.

_____. "The Socio-cultural Context in Education." In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Research and Policy Implications, Lau Task Force Report*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1976.

Larsen-Freeman, D. "The Acquisition of Grammatical Morphemes by Adult ESL Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 9:409-419, 1975.

_____. "An Explanation for the Morpheme Accuracy Order of Learners of English as a Second Language." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

Lasswell, H.D. and others. *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965.

Lebach, S.M. "A Report on the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in Its Third Year: Implications for Language and Subject Matter Acquisition, Language, and Attitudes." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1974.

Leibowitz, A.H. "The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools." *Revista de Derecho Puertorriqueño (Ponce)* 175-244, 1970.

_____. "English Literacy: Legal Sanction for Discrimination." *Revista Juridica de la Universidad de Puerto Rico* 313-400, 1970.

_____. *Educational Policy and Political Acceptance: The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971.

_____. "A History of Language Instruction in American Indian Schools: The Imposition of English by Government Policy." In *Bilingual Education for American Indians*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1971.

_____. "Language as a Means of Social Control: The United States Experience." Paper prepared for the 8th World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, 1974.

Leiter, K.C.W. "Ad Hocing in the Schools: A Study of Placement Practices in the Kindergartens of Two Schools." In *Language Use and School Performance*, edited by A.V. Cicourel and others. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Lemon, N. "Linguistic Development and Conceptualization: A Bilingual Study." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 6:2, 193-198, 1975.

Leopold, W.F. *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: A Linguist's Record*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1939-49 [4 vols.].

Lester, M. "Bilingual Education in the United States, the Pacific and Southeast Asia." *Topics in Culture Learning* 2:137-145, 1974.

Lewis, D. *Convention*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Lewis, E.G. *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

_____. "Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: The Ancient World to the Renaissance." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Leyba, C.F. "Research in Progress: Spotlight on Santa Fe, N.M." *Forum* 1:3, 1978.

Li, C. *Word Order and Word Order Change*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1974.

_____. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Liedke, W.W. and L.D. Nelson. "Concept Formation and Bilingualism." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 14:225-232, 1968.

Linde, R. "A Diagnosis of Grammar Errors Made by Japanese Persons Speaking English as a Second Language." PhD dissertation [unpublished], American University, 1971.

LiNinyoles, R. *Idioma y poder social*. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos, 1972.

Litsinger, D.E. *The Challenge of Teaching Mexican-American Students*. New York: American Book Co, 1973.

LoCoco, V. "A Comparison of Three Methods for the Collection of L_2 Data: Free Composition, Translation, and Picture Description." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 8:59-86, 1976.

Los Angeles Unified School District. *Bridging the Asian Language and Cultural Gap: A Handbook for Teachers*. Los Angeles: Author, 1971-74.

Macías, R.F. "Developing a Bilingual Culturally-relevant Educational Program for Chicanos." *Aztlán* 4:1, 61-84, 1973.

_____. "Opinions of Chicano Community Parents on Bilingual Preschool Education." Paper presented at the 8th World Congress of Sociology, Toronto, 1974.

Mackey, W.F. *Bilingualism as a World Problem*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1967.

_____. *Bilingual Education in a Binational School*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972.

_____. "A Typology of Bilingual Education." In *Advances in the Sociology of Language II*, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

_____. "The Educational Ecology of Multilingualism." Paper prepared for the 1st Annual International Multilingual-Multicultural Conference, San Diego, 1973.

_____. "The Evaluation of Bilingual Education." In *Frontiers* *of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R.L. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Mackey, W.F. and V.N. Beebe. *Bilingual Schools for a Bicultural Community*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____ and T. Andersson, eds. *Bilingualism in Early Childhood: Papers from a Conference on Child Language* (Studies in Bilingual Education). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

MacKinnon, K.M. "Language-shift and Education: Conversation of Ethno-linguistic Culture amongst School Children of a Gaelic Community." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* in press.

Macnamara, J. *Bilingualism in Primary Education*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

_____. "The Effects of Instruction in a Weaker Language." *Journal of Social Issues* 32:2, 121-135, 1967.

_____. "The Generalizability of Results of Studies of Bilingual Education." In *Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education*, edited by S.T. Carey. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: University of Alberta Press, 1974.

_____. "What Happens to Children Whose Home Language Is Not That of the School?" Montreal: McGill University, 1974.

_____ and others. "Attending a Primary School of the Other Language in Montreal." In *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*, edited by A. Simões, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Major, R.C. "Phonological Differentiation of a Bilingual Child." *Ohio State University Papers in Linguistics* 22:88-122, 1977.

Malherbe, E.D. *The Bilingual School*. London: Longmans, 1946.

_____. "Commentary to R.M. Jones, 'How and When Do Persons Become Bilingual?'" In *Description and Measurement of Bilingualism*, edited by L.G. Kelly. Toronto: University Press, 1969.

Malinowsky, B. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

_____. *The Dynamics of Culture Change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1945.

Malson, L. and J-M-G. Itard. *Wolf Children and the Problems of Human Nature*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Markman, B.R. and others. "The Use of Elicited Imitation in Search of an Interim French Grammar." *Language Learning* 25:31-41, 1975.

Marquevich, P. and S. Spiegel. *Multiethnic Studies in the Elementary School Classroom*. Pico Rivera, CA: Education in Motion, 1976.

Martin, J.P. *A Survey of the Current Study and Teaching of North American Indian Languages in the U.S. and Canada*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Matluck, J.H. and B.J. Mace. "Language Characteristics of Mexican-American Children: Implications for Assessment." *Journal of School Psychology* 11:4, 365-386, 1973.

Mazeika, E.J. "A Comparison of the Grammar of a Monolingual and

Bilingual Child." Paper presented at SRCD conference, Philadelphia, 1973.

McBride, C. "A Survey of ERIC Reports and Inservice Programs for Teachers in Spanish Bilingual Education Programs." MA report [unpublished], University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

McDermott, R.P. "Achieving School Failure." In Education and Cultural Process, edited by G. Spindler. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

_____. "Kids Make Sense: An Ethnographic Account of the Interactional Management of Success and Failure in One First-grade Classroom." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Stanford University, 1976.

_____. "The Cultural Context of Learning to Read." In Issues in Evaluating Reading (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Linguistics and Reading Series, No. 1), edited by Stanley F. Wanat. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

McKay, R. "Standardized Tests: Objective/Objectified Measures of Competence." In Language Use and School Performance, edited by A.V. Cicourel and others. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

McNeill, D. The Acquisition of Language: The Study of Developmental Psycholinguistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Mehan, H. "Assessing Students' Language Using Abilities: Cross Cultural and Methodological Implications." In Comparative Social Research, edited by M. Armer and A.D. Grimshaw. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1974.

_____. "Accomplishing Classroom Lessons." In Language Use and School Performance, edited by A.V. Cicourel and others. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

_____. "Viewpoint: Ethnography." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____ and H. Wood. The Reality of Ethnomethodology. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1975.

_____ and others. The Social Organization of Classroom Lessons (Report No. 67). La Jolla, CA: Center for Human Information Processing, University of California, San Diego, 1976.

Merritt, R.L. Symbols of American Community, 1735-1775. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.

Mikes, M. "Acquisition des categories grammaticales dans le langage de l'enfant." Enfance 20:289-298, 1967.

Milan, W.G. "Sociolinguistics: Contributions to Bilingual Education, A Practitioner's Response." Paper prepared for the Bilingual Education Symposium, Linguistic Society of America Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1975.

_____. "The Language of Instruction: Linguistic Considerations vs. Attitudinal Realities." Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Bilingual-Bicultural Education, San Antonio, TX, 1976.

Milon, J.P. "The Development of Negation in English by a Second Language Learner." TESOL Quarterly 8:2, 137-143, 1974.

Mitchell, C.I. "Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

Modiano, N. "Reading Comprehension in the National Language: A Comparative Study of Bilingual and All-Spanish Approaches to Reading Instruction in Selected Indian Schools in the Highlands of Chiapas, Mexico." PhD dissertation, New York University, 1966.

_____. "Bilingual Education for Children of Linguistic Minorities." *América Indígena* 28:405-414, 1968.

_____. *Indian Education in the Chiapas Highlands.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Molina, J. "Proposed Legislative Changes and the Future of Bilingual Education." Address delivered at the 6th Annual International Bilingual/Bicultural Education Conference, New Orleans, LA, 1977.

Morel, S. *Total Immersion Language Program: A New Approach to Foreign Instruction.* Albany, NY: State Department of Education, Division of Research, 1971.

Morgan, C. "The Effects of Bilingual Instruction on the English Language Arts Achievement of First Grade Children." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Northwestern State University of Louisiana, 1971.

Moss, M.H. *Tests of Basic Experiences (TOBE).* Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, Del Norte Research Park, 1970.

Mougeon, R. "Progress Report on the Sociolinguistic Surveys of Two French Canadian Communities in Ontario." Toronto: OISE, 1975.

Mowrer, O.H. "The Psychologist Looks at Language." *American Journal of Psychology* 9:660-694, 1954.

Muckley, R.L. "After Childhood, What Then? An Overview of Ethnic Language Retention (ELRT) Programs in the United States." *Revista Americana Review* 2, 53-67, 1972.

Murrell, M. "Language Acquisition in a Trilingual Environment: Notes from a Case Study." *Studia Lingüística* 20:9-35, 1966.

Naiman, N. "The Use of Elicited Imitation in Second Language Acquisition Research." *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 2:2-37, 1974.

_____. "Comprehension, Imitation, and Production of Certain Syntactic Structures by Children Acquiring a Second Language." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Toronto, 1975.

_____ and others. *The Good Language Learner.* Toronto: Modern Language Center, OISE, 1975.

Natalicio, D.C. and L.F. Natalicio. "A Comparative Study of English Pluralization by Native and Non-native English Speakers." *Child Development* 42:1302-1306, 1971.

National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). *Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines: Position Statement.* Washington, DC: Author, 1978.

National Education Association. *The Invisible Minority: Pero no vencibles.* Washington, DC: Author, 1966.

National Indian Brotherhood. Indian Control of Indian Education. Ottawa: Author, 1972.

Native American Materials Development Center. Navajo Curriculum Series. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1976.

Nemser, W. "Approximate Systems of Foreign Language Learners." IRAL 9:115-123, 1971.

Neufeld, G.G. "The Bilingual's Lexical Store." IRAL 14:1, 15-35, 1976.

Newman, E. Strictly Speaking. New York: Warner Books, 1975.

New Republic. "Bilingual Education: Legislative Proposals." October 21, 1967, p. 9; November 18, 1967, pp. 44-45.

Nielsen, T.H. "Early Stages in the Non-native Acquisition of English Syntax: A Study of Three Children from Zaire, XXXX Venezuela, and Saudi Arabia." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Indiana University, 1974.

Nieves-Squires, S. "Viewpoint: Anthropology." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons. Middlebury, VT: Author, 1976.

O'Barr, W.M. and J.F. O'Barr, eds. Language and Politics. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Ohannessian, S. and other eds. Language Surveys in Developing Nations: Papers and Reports on Sociolinguistic Surveys. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Oksaar, E. "Implications of Language Contact for Bilingual Language Acquisition." Paper presented at the 9th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago, 1973.

Olesini, J. "The Effect of Bilingual Instruction on the Achievement of Elementary Pupils." PhD dissertation [unpublished], East Texas State University, 1971.

Olmstead-Gary, J. "The Effects on Children of Delayed Oral Practice in Initial Stages of Second Language Learning." PhD dissertation [unpublished], UCLA, 1974.

O'Malley, J.M. "Mandated Research and Clearinghouse Activities in Bilingual Education." NABE Journal 2(1):25-29, 1978.

Omar, A.H. "Supranational Standardization of Spelling Systems: The Case of Malaysia and Indonesia." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 5, 77-92, 1975.

Ornstein, J. The Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism: A Status Report (Southwest Areal Linguistics). San Diego, CA: Institute for Cultural Pluralism, 1974.

Orvik, J.M. "An Overview of Alaska Native Bilingual Education." Topics in Culture Learning 3:109-124, 1975.

Osgood, C.E. "A Behavioristic Analysis of Perception and Language as Cognitive Phenomena." In Contemporary Approaches to Cognition, A Symposium Held at the University of Colorado. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Osser, H. and others. "The Young Child's Ability to Imitate and

Comprehend Speech: A Comparison of Two Subcultural Groups." *Child Development* 40:1063-1076, 1969.

Oxman, W.G. "The Effects of Ethnic Identity of Experimenter, Language of Experimental Task, and Bilingual vs. Non-Bilingual School Attendance on the Verbal Task Performance of Bilingual Children of Puerto Rican Background." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Fordham University, 1971.

Palmer, H.E. *The Principles of Language Study*. New York: World Book Co, 1926.

Palmer, L. and B. Spolsky. *Papers on Language Testing*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1975.

Park, R.E. *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922.

Parker, L.L. "On the Need for Consensus Translation." *Linguistic Reporter* 20:8, 1978.

Parker, W.R. *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 1962.

Paulston, C.B. "On the Moral Dilemma of the Sociolinguist." *Language Learning* 21:2, 175-181, 1971.

_____. *Implications of Language Learning Theory for Language Planning: Concerns in Bilingual Education* (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series No. 1). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974.

_____. "Ethnic Relations and Bilingual Education: Accounting for Contradictory Data." In *Proceedings of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education*, edited by R.C. Troike and N. Modiano. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

_____. "Viewpoint: Research." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____. "Theoretical Perspectives of Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1978.

Paulston, R.G. "Ethnic Revival and Educational Conflict in Swedish Lapland." *Comparative Education Review* 20:2, 179-192, 1976.

_____. *Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Center for International Studies, 1976.

Peal, E. and W.E. Lambert. "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence." *Psychological Monographs* 76:27, 1962.

Peck, S. "Child-Child Discourse in Second Language Acquisition." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

Peña, A. "Federal Legislative Funding for Bilingual Programs." Paper presented at the International Multilingual-Multicultural Conference in San Diego, CA, 1973.

Perissinotto, G. "La integración lingüística del indígena mexicana: teoría y practica de la castellanización." *América Indigena* 34:4, 957-964, 1974.

Perkins, K. and D. Larsen-Freeman. "The Effect of Formal Language Instruction on the Order of Morpheme Acquisition." *Language Learning* 25:2, 237-243, 1975.

Philips, S.U. "Acquisition of Rules for Appropriate Speech Usage." In *Report of the Twenty-first Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1970.

Phillips, J.M. "Code-Switching in Bilingual Classrooms." MA thesis [unpublished], California State University, Northridge, 1975.

Plann, S. "The Spanish Immersion Program: Towards Native-like Proficiency or a Classroom Dialect?" MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1976.

Polich, E. "Report on the Evaluation of the Lower Elementary French Immersion Program through Grade 3, 1971-73." Montreal: Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1973.

Politzer, R.L. and L. Weiss. *Characteristics and Behaviors of the Successful Foreign Language Teacher* (Technical Report No. 5). Stanford, CA: Stanford University School of Education, 1969.

_____ and M.R. Hoover. "On the Use of Attitude Variables in the Teaching of a Second Dialect." *IRAL* 12:43-51, 1974.

Pool, J. "Mass Opinion on Language Policy: The Case of Canada." In *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research*, edited by J. Rubin and R. Shuy. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Quandt, W. *Revolution and Political Leadership: Algeria 1954-1958*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969.

Quay, L.C. "Language Dialect, Reinforcement, and the Intelligence Test Performance of Negro Children." *Child Development* 42:5-15, 1971.

_____. "Negro Dialect and Binet Performance in Severely Disadvantaged Black Four-Year-Olds." *Child Development* 43:245-250, 1972.

_____. "Language Dialect, Age, and Intelligence-Test Performance in Disadvantaged Black Children." *Child Development* 45: 463-468, 1974.

Rabin, C. "Spelling Reform: Israel 1968." In *Can Language Be Planned?*, edited by J. Rubin and B. Jernudd. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1971.

Ramírez, A.G. "The Spoken English of Spanish-speaking Pupils in a Bilingual and Monolingual School Setting: An Analysis of Syntactic Development." PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1974.

_____ and R.L. Politzer. "The Acquisition of English and the Maintenance of Spanish in a Bilingual Education Program." *TESOL Quarterly* 9:113-124, 1975.

_____ and R.L. Politzer. "Comprehension and Production in English as a Second Language by Elementary School Children and Adolescents." Unpublished ms., 1976.

_____ and R.L. Politzer. *Language Attitudes and the Achievement* of Bilingual Pupils (Research and Development Memorandum No. 146). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

Ramírez, M., III and C. Castañeda. Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development, and Education. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

——— and others. Spanish-English Bilingual Education in the U.S.: Current Issues, Resources, and Research Priorities (Papers in Applied Linguistics, Bilingual Education Series No. 5). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Ramos, M. and others. The Determination and Implementation of Language Policy. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1967.

Ramos Perea, I. "El ajuste escolar de los estudiantes migrantes --estudio piloto." Boletín 2:1, 1970.

Ravem, R. "The Development of Wh-Questions in First and Second Language Learners." In New Frontiers in Second Language, edited by J.H. Schumann and N. Stenson. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1974.

———. "Second Language Acquisition: A Study of Two Norwegian Children's Acquisition of English Syntax in a Naturalistic Setting." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Essex, 1974.

Rayfield, J.R. The Languages of a Bilingual Community. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Read, J. and others. "Socioeconomic Implications of Bilingual Education on the Navajo Reservation." In The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Education Themes, edited by A. Simões, Jr. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Reed, C. Dialects of American English. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Co, 1967.

Reibel, D.A. "Language Learning Strategies for the Adult." In The Psychology of Second Language Learning, edited by P. Pimsleur and T. Quinn. Cambridge, MA: University of Cambridge Press, 1971.

Remillard, L. and others. "The Role of Phonology and Lexicon in Eliciting Reactions to Dialect Variation." Anthropological Linguistics pp. 383-397, December 1973.

Reyes, V.H. Bilingual-Bicultural Education: The Chicago Experience. Chicago: Bicultural-Bilingual Studies, 1975.

Richards, J.C. "A Non-contrastive Approach to Error Analysis." In Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher, edited by J.W. Oller and J.C. Richards. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1973.

Riegel, K.F. and R.O. Freedle. "What Does It Take To Be Bilingual or Bidialectal?" In A Seminar on Black English, edited by D. Harrison and T. Trabasso. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Assoc, 1975.

Rivera, E. "Academic Achievement, Bi-Cultural Attitudes and Self-Concepts of Pupils in Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Programs." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Fordham University, 1973.

Rivers, W.M. The Psychologist and the Foreign-Language Teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

_____. Teaching Foreign-Language Skills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Robbins, M. "The Effects of Feedback on the Eradication of Errors in Verb Forms by ESL Students." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1976.

Rodríguez-Brown, F.V. and others. "Language Interaction in a Bilingual Classroom." Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1976.

Rosenberg, C., ed. The Family in History. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.

Rosenfeld, S. "Bilingualism and the Melting Pot." The Washington Post, September 27, 1974.

Roth, D.R. "Intelligence Testing as a Social Activity." In Language Use and School Performance, edited by A.V. Cicourel and others. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rouchdy, A.A. "A Case of Bilingualism: An Investigation of Lexical and Syntactic Interference in the Performance of a Bilingual Child." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1970.

Rubin, J. "Bilingual Usage in Paraguay." In Readings in the Sociology of Language, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

_____. "Language Planning Theory and Documents." The Linguistic Reporter 14:4, 7-10, 1974.

_____. "Bilingual Education and Language Planning." In Frontiers of Bilingual Education, edited by B. Spolsky and R.L. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____ and B.H. Jernudd, eds. Can Language Be Planned? Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971.

_____ and R.W. Shuy, eds. Language Planning: Current Issues and Research. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

_____ and others. Language Planning Processes. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

Rudner, R.S. Philosophy of Social Science. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Saint-Jacques, B. Aspects sociolinguistiques du bilinguisme canadien. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism, 1976.

St. John, N.H. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Samuda, R.J. Psychological Testing of American Minorities: Issues and Consequences. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co, 1975.

Sanches, M. and B. Blount, eds. Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Use (Language, Thought, and Culture: Advances in the Study of Cognition, 3). New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Sánchez, R. "Nuestra circunstancia lingüística." El Grito 6:1, 45-74, 1972.

_____. "A Generative Study of the Two Spanish Dialects." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas at Austin, 1974.

Savard, J.G. and R. Vigneault, eds. Multilingual Political Systems: Problems and Solutions. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1975.

Savignon, S.J. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

_____. "Talking with My Son: An Example of Communicative Competence." In Careers, Communication and Culture in Foreign Language Teaching, edited by F.M. Grittner. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co, 1974.

Saville, M.R. and R.C. Troike. A Handbook of Bilingual Education. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1971.

Saville-Troike, M.R. Bilingual Children: A Resource Document (Papers in Applied Linguistics: Bilingual Education Series No. 2). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

_____. Foundations for Teaching English as a Second Language: Theory and Method for Multicultural Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

_____. A Guide to Culture in the Classroom. Arlington, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1978.

Sayler, M.L. Parents: Active Partners in Education. Washington, DC: American Association of Elementary, Kindergarten, and Nursery Educators, 1971.

Schachter, J. "An Error in Error Analysis." Language Learning 24:2, 205-214, 1974.

Scherer, G.A.C. and M. Wertheimer. A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Schermerhorn, R.A. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House, 1970.

Schlue, K. "An Inside View of Interlanguage." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1976.

Schneider, S. Revolution, Reaction or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act. New York: Las Americas Publishing Co, 1977.

Schumann, J. "Second Language Acquisition: The Pidginization Hypothesis." PhD dissertation [unpublished], Harvard, 1975.

_____. "Social and Psychological Distance Factors in Second Language Acquisition." Paper presented at the Second Language Acquisition Forum, UCLA, 1976.

_____. "The Acculturation Model for Second-Language Acquisition." In Second-Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching, edited by R. Gingras. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Scott, M.S. and G.R. Tucker. "Error Analysis and English Language Strategies for Arab Students." Language Learning 24: 69-97, 1974.

Scott, S. "The Relation of Divergent Thinking to Bilingualism: Cause or Effect?" Research report [unpublished], McGill University, 1973.

Scribner, S. and M. Cole. "Effects of Constrained Recall Training on Children's Performance in Verbal Memory Task." Child Development 43:845-857, 1972.

Seda, E. "Bilingual Education in a Pluralistic Context: The Rican." Journal of Contemporary Thought 1:4, 19-26, 1972.

Seda Bonilla, E. "Cultural Pluralism and the Education of Puerto Rican Youths." Phi Betan Kappan 53:294-296, 1972.

_____. Requiem Para Una Cultura. Río Piedras: Bayoan, 1975.

Seelye, H.N. Teaching Culture: Strategies for Foreign Language Educators. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co, 1975.

_____. "Viewpoint: Sociology and Education." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 1. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____ and others. "Do Bilingual Education Programs Inhibit English Language Achievement? A Report on an Illinois Experiment." Paper presented at the 7th Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1973.

Segalowitz, N. "Psychological Perspective on Bilingual Education." In Frontiers in Bilingual Education, edited by B. Spolsky and R.L. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

Selinker, L. "Interlanguage." IRAL 10:209-231, 1972.

_____ and others. "The Interlanguage Hypothesis Extended to Children." Language Learning 25:139-152, 1975.

Setton, A. "Etude morphologique de la langue parlée par des enfants anglophones des classes expérimentales d'immersion de l'école élémentaire St. Lambert, à St-Lambert, Québec." MA thesis [unpublished], University of Montreal, 1974.

Sevilla-Casas, E. and others. "Addenda of Chicanos and Boricuas to Declaration of Chicago." Paper prepared for the 9th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, 1973.

Shanker, A. "Bilingual Education: Not 'Why' but 'How'." New York Times, November 3, 1974, section 4, p. 11.

Shapira, R. "A Study of the Acquisition of Ten Syntactic Structures and Grammatical Morphemes by an Adult Second Language Learner." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1976.

Shore, M.S. "The Content Analysis of 125 Title VII Bilingual Programs Funded in 1969 and 1970." New York: Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit, Project BEST, New York City Bilingual Consortium, Hunter College Division, 1974.

_____. "The Purposes, Work and Resources of the Modeling Innovative Programs Unit." Albany, NY: State Department of Education, 1972.

Shultz, J. "Language Use in Bilingual Classrooms." Paper presented at TESOL convention, Los Angeles, 1975.

_____. It's Not Whether You Win or Lose, But How You Play the Game (Working Paper No. 1). Cambridge, MA: Newton Classroom Interaction Proj, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1976.

Shuy, R.W. "Variability and the Public Image of Language." Paper presented at NWAVE IV, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, 1975.

Shuy, R.W. "Toward a Cross-Disciplinary View of Bilingual Education." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

_____ and R.W. Fasold, eds. *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1973.

Sibayan, B.P. "Language Planning Processes and the Language-Policy Survey in the Philippines." In *Can Language Be Planned?*, edited by J. Rubin and B. Jernudd. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1971.

Siegrist, D.S. *Language and Bilingual Education*. Los Angeles, CA: Multilingual Multicultural Materials Development Center, 1977.

Silverman, R.J. and others. *Oral Language Tests for Bilingual Students: An Evaluation of Language Dominance and Proficiency Instruments*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Center for Bilingual Education, 1976.

Simões, A., ed. *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Simpson, C. "Review of *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children*, by Nancy St. John." *Contemporary Sociology* 5:37-38, 1976.

Sinclair, J. and R.H. Coulthard. *An Analysis of Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

_____ and R.M. Coulthard. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Siquan, M., ed. *Bilingüismo y Educación en Cataluna*. Barcelona: Editorial Tiede, 1975.

Sirgado, I.C. "Bilingual Education, Here to Stay?" *Time Frame* 5:1, 22, 1976.

Skinner, B.F. *Verbal Behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Skoczylas, V. "An Evaluation of Some Cognitive and Affective Aspects of a Spanish-English Bilingual Education Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of New Mexico, 1972.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. "Bilingualism, Semibilingualism and School Achievement." Paper presented at the 4th International Congress of Applied Linguists, Stuttgart, 1975.

_____ and P. Toukomaa. *Teaching Migrant Children's Mother-Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Socio-cultural Situation of the Migrant Family*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO, 1976.

Slobin, D., ed. *The Ontogenesis of Grammar: A Theoretical Symposium*. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Smith, G.W. and O.L. Caskey. *Promising School Practices for Mexican Americans*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1972.

Smith, P.D. *A Comparison of the Cognitive and Audiolingual Approaches to Foreign Language Instruction*. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development, 1970.

Smolicz, J.J. "Ethnic Languages in a Plural Society: A Humanistic Sociological Perspective." Adelaide, Australia: Department of Education, University of Adelaide, 1975.

Snow, C.E. "Mother's Speech to Children Learning Language." *Child Development* 43:549-565, 1972.

_____ and C.A. Ferguson. *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Sodhi, S.S. "Uznadeze's Set and Second Language Learning." *International Journal of Psychology* 4:4, 317-319, 1969.

Spanish Dame Bilingual Bicultural Project. *Instructional Guide for the Home Tutor*. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1974.

_____. *Planning Program with the Home Tutor*. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1975.

Spilka, I.V. "Assessment of Second Language Performance in Immersion Programs." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32:543-561, 1976.

Spolsky, B. *American Indian Bilingual Education*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

_____. *A Model for the Description, Analysis, and Perhaps Evaluation of Bilingual Education*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

_____. "Speech Communities and Schools." *TESOL Quarterly* 8: 17-26, 1974.

_____. "Problems in the Assessment of the Effect of Bilingual Education in a Multilingual Society." Paper prepared for the Multilingual-Multicultural Materials Development Center, 1976.

Spolsky, B. "The Establishment of Language Education Policy in Multilingual Societies." In *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*, edited by B. Spolsky and R. Cooper. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____, ed. *Approaches to Language Testing* (Papers in Applied Linguistics: Advances in Language Testing, No. 2). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

_____ and R. Cooper, eds. *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977.

_____ and others. "Three Functional Tests of Oral Proficiency." *TESOL Quarterly* 6:221-235, 1972.

Staats, A.W. *Learning, Language and Cognition*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Stanley, M.H. "French Immersion Programs: The Experience of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 32:152-161, 1974.

State Education Department of New York. *Bilingual Education, a Position Paper*. Albany, NY: Author, 1972.

Steinberg, L.S. *Report on Bilingual Education: A Study of Programs for Pupils with English Language Difficulty in New York City Public Schools*. New York: Community Service Society, 1974.

Stent, M. and others. *Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973.

Stern, H.H., ed. Foreign Languages in Primary Education: The Teaching of Foreign or Second Languages to Younger Children. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education, 1963.

_____. Study E7: Report on Bilingual Education. Quebec: The Quebec Official Publisher, 1973.

Stoller, P. "The Language Planning Activities of the U.S. Office of Bilingual Education." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 11:45-60, 1976.

Stone, J.C. and C.P. DeNevi, eds. Teaching Multi-Cultural Populations. New York: Van Nostrand, 1971.

Swain, M. "French Immersion Programs Across Canada." The Canadian Modern Language Review 31:117-129, 1974.

_____. "Writing Skills of Grade Three French Immersion Pupils." Working Papers on Bilingualism 7:1-38, 1975.

_____. "Evaluation of Bilingual Education Programs: Problems and Some Solutions." Paper presented at the 20th annual convention of the Comparative and International Education Society, Toronto, 1976.

_____. "Bibliography: Research on Immersion Education for the Majority Child." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:5, 592-596, 1976.

_____. Some Issues in Bilingual Education in Canada. Quebec City: Laval University Press, 1976.

_____ and M. Bruck, eds. "Immersion Education for the Majority Child." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:5, 490-610, 1975.

_____ and others. "Alternatives to Spontaneous Speech: Elicited Translation and Imitation as Indicators of Second Language Competence." Working Papers on Bilingualism 3:45-68, 1974.

Swanson, M.M. "Bilingual Education: The National Perspective." ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education 5:74-127, 1974.

Systems and Evaluations in Education. New Approaches to Bilingual Bicultural Education. Austin, TX: DACBE, 1974.

Szasz, M. Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination, 1928-1973. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Tanka, J. "An Error Analysis of the Speech of Russian ESL Learners." UCLA Psycholinguistics TESL Project, 1972.

Tarone, E. "Speech Perception in Second Language Acquisition: A Suggested Model." Language Learning 24:223-233, 1974.

_____. "Some Influences on Interlanguage Phonology." Paper presented at the TESL conference, Los Angeles, 1975.

_____ and others. "Some Limitations to the Classroom Applications of Current Second Language Research." TESOL Quarterly 10:1, 19-32, 1976.

Tax, S. "Action Anthropology." Current Anthropology 16:4, 514-517, 1975.

Taylor, B.P. "Overgeneralization and Transfer as Learning Strategies in Second Language Learning." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Michigan, 1974.

_____. "Adult Language Learning Strategies and Their Pedagogical Implications." *TESOL Quarterly* 9:391-399, 1975.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). *Position Paper on the Role of English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: Author, 1976.

Teitelbaum, H. and R.J. Hiller. "The Legal Perspective." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 3*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Teschner, R.V. and other eds. *Spanish and English of United States Hispanos: A Critical, Annotated, Linguistic Bibliography*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Texas Education Agency. *A Design for Implementing in Public School Curriculum the Concept of Confluence of Texan Cultures*. Austin, TX: Author, 1970.

_____. *An Orientation to Bilingual Education in Texas: A Training Manual*. Austin, TX: Author, 1976.

Thorndike, E.L. and A.I. Gates. "The Ultimate Aims of Education." In *Readings in the Philosophy of Education*, edited by J.M. Rich. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co, 1966.

Time Magazine. "The Three R's in 70 Tongues: Debating the Uses of Bilingual Education." February 13, 1978, p. 65.

Torrance, E.P. and others. "Creative Functioning of Monolingual and Bilingual Children in Singapore." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 61:72-75, 1970.

Toukomaa, P. and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. "The Intensive Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Migrant Children at Pre-school Age." Tampere, Finland: Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere *Tutkimuksia Research Reports*, 1977.

Trites, R.L. "Children with Learning Difficulties in Primary French Immersion." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 33: 193-207, 1976.

_____ and M.A. Price. *Learning Disabilities Found in Association with French Immersion Programming*. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1975.

Tran, T.C. "Concepts of Development in Second Language Learning and Teaching." *IRAL* 13:119-143, 1975.

Traugott, E.C. "Explorations in Linguistic Elaboration: Language Change, Language Acquisition, and the Givens of Spatio-Temporal Terms." In *Historical Linguistics I*, edited by J.M. Anderson and C. Jones. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1974.

Treviño, B.A.G. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of a Bilingual Program in the Teaching of Mathematics in the Primary Grades." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Texas, 1969.

Troike, R.C. and N. Modiano, eds. *Proceedings of the First Inter-American Conference on Bilingual Education*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

_____ and E. Pérez. "Bilingual Education at the Crossroads." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 5*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Trueba, H.T., comp. *Bilingual Bicultural Education for the Spanish Speaking in the United States: A Preliminary Bibliography*. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing Co, 1977.

Tsushima, W.T. and T.P. Hogan. "Verbal Ability and School Achievement of Bilingual and Monolingual Children of Different Ages." Journal of Educational Research 68:349-353, 1975.

Tucker, G.R. "The Development of Reading Skills within a Bilingual Education Program." In Language and Reading, edited by S.S. Smiley and J.C. Towner. Bellingham, WA: Western Washington State College, 1975.

_____. "The Linguistic Perspective." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

_____ and A. d'Anglejan. "Some Thoughts Concerning Bilingual Education Programs." The Modern Language Journal 55:491-493, 1971.

_____ and G.A. Cziko. "The Role of Evaluation in Bilingual Education." Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, 1978.

_____ and others. "Affective, Cognitive and Social Factors in Second Language Acquisition." The Canadian Modern Language Review 32:214-226, 1976.

Tyler, R.W. and other eds. Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally ,1968.

UNESCO. The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education (Monograph on Fundamental Education). Paris: UNESCO, 1953. [Also appears in: Readings in the Sociology of Language, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.]

_____. The Teaching of Modern Languages (Problems in Education Series Vol. X). Paris: Author, 1955.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican-American Educational Series, Report II: The Unfinished Education: Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States. Washington, DC: USGPO, 1971.

_____. Teachers and Students (Report V: Mexican American Education Study). Washington, DC: USGPO, 1973.

_____. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education (Clearinghouse Publication No. 51). Washington, DC: USGPO, 1975.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Bilingual Education: An Unmet Need. Washington, DC: Author, 1976.

U.S. Office of Education. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation. Washington, DC: Author, 1976.

Uyekubo, A. "Language Switching of Japanese-English Bilinguals." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1972.

Vachek, J. A Prague School Reader in Linguistics. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Valencia, A. Bilingual-Bicultural Education for the Spanish-English Bilingual. Las Vegas, NM: New Mexico Highlands University, 1972.

Valette, R. Modern Language Testing: A Handbook. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1967.

Van Dyke, V. "Human Rights without Distinction as to Language." International Studies Quarterly 20:1, 1976.

_____. "The Individual, the State, and Ethnic Communities in Political Theory." World Politics 29:3, 1977.

Van Mettre, P.D. "Syntactic Characteristics of Selected Bilingual Children." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Arizona, 1972.

Velásquez, G.J. "Evaluation of a Bilingual Bicultural Education Program." PhD dissertation [unpublished], United States International University, 1973.

von Maltitz, F.W. Living and Learning in Two Languages: Bilingual-Bicultural Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Wabaunsee, A.J. "Addendum: Native American Viewpoint." In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 3. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Waggoner, D. "Results of the Survey of Languages, Supplement to the July 1975 Current Population Survey." Paper presented to the 5th Annual International Bilingual-Bicultural Education Conference, San Antonio, TX, 1976. [See also The Linguistic Reporter 19(3):5, 1976.]

Wagner-Gough, J. "Comparative Studies in Second Language Learning." MATESL thesis, UCLA, 1975.

_____ and E. Hatch. "The Importance of Input Data in Second Language Acquisition Studies." Language Learning 25:2, 297-308, 1975.

Waldman, E.L. "Cross-ethnic Attitudes of Anglo Students in Spanish Immersion, Bilingual, and English Schooling." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1975.

Wallace, A. "Schools in Revolutionary Conservative Societies." In Anthropology and Education, edited by F.C. Gruber. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961.

Wallace, A.F.C. "Revitalization Movements." American Anthropologist 68:1, 204-281, 1966.

_____. "Nativism and Revivalism." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 11:75-80, 1968.

Wang, W.S-Y. "Political Aspects of Bilingual Bicultural Education." Paper presented at the California Association for Bilingual Education, San Francisco, 1977.

Warshawsky, D.R. "The Acquisition of Four English Morphemes by Spanish-speaking Children." PhD dissertation [unpublished], University of Michigan, 1975.

Waserstein, A. "Organizing for Bilingual Education--One Community's Experience." Un Nuevo Día 2:2, 12-13, 1976.

Wax, M. and R. Luhman. Bilingual Classrooms in a Mexican-American Community. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1974.

Weffer, R.C.E. "The Effects of First Language Instruction in Academic and Psychological Development of Bilingual Children." ogy, 1972.

Weinreich, U. Languages in Contact. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.

Weinstein, B. "Language Strategies: Redefining Political Communities on the Basis of Linguistic Choices." Paper presented to the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC, 1976.

_____. "Viewpoint: Political Science." In *Bilingual Education : Current Perspectives, Vol. 1*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Whitely, W. Swahili: *The Rise of a National Language*. London: Methuen, 1969.

Williams, F. and G. Van Wart. *Carrascolendas: Bilingual Education through Television*. New York: Praeger, 1974.

Williams, R. and W. Rivers. "Mismatches in Testing from Black English." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, HI, 1972.

Willke, I. "Schooling of Immigrant Children in West Germany-Sweden-England: The Educationally Disadvantaged." *International Review of Education* 21:3, 357-382, 1975.

Winer, B.J. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Wolf, C.P., ed. *Social Impact Assessment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Technology, 1974.

Wolfram, W. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Assimilation: Puerto Rican English in New York City*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1973.

Wood, P.H. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stone Rebellion*. New York: Knopf, 1974.

Woodford, P. "Viewpoint: The Importance of Testing." In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 4*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Wright, L.B. "Thomas Jefferson and the Classics." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 87:3, 223-233, 1943.

Yoshida, M. "The Acquisition of English Vocabulary by a Japanese-speaking Child Learning English in a Natural Setting." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1976.

Young, D.I. "The Acquisition of English Syntax by Three Spanish-speaking Children." MATESL thesis [unpublished], UCLA, 1974.

Young, R.W. "Written Navajo: A Brief History." In *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*, edited by J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

Youngblood, C.A. "Putting Black into Brown in Early Childhood Curricular Materials." *Social Education* 42(3):188-200, 1978.

Zirkel, P.A. *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Selected Experimental Bilingual Education Programs in Connecticut*. West Hartford, CT: University of Hartford, 1972.

_____. "A Method for Determining and Depicting Language Dominance." *TESOL Quarterly* 8:1, 7-16, 1974.

_____ and J.F. Greene. "The Development of a Scale Designed to Measure Cultural Attitudes." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974.

Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives

Volume 1: Social Science
Volume 2: Linguistics
Volume 3: Law
Volume 4: Education
Volume 5: Synthesis